

•

CONTEMPORARY THINKING ABOUT PAUL
AN ANTHOLOGY

•

CONTEMPORARY THINKING ABOUT PAUL

AN ANTHOLOGY

Compiled by
THOMAS S. KEPLER
Professor of New Testament
Oberlin Graduate School of Theology



ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS
NEW YORK • NASHVILLE

CONTEMPORARY THINKING ABOUT PAUL

**COPYRIGHT MCML
BY PIERCE & SMITH**

All rights in this book are reserved. No part of the text may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publishers, except brief quotations used in connection with reviews in magazines or newspapers.

**SET UP, PRINTED, AND BOUND BY THE
PARTHENON PRESS, AT NASHVILLE,
TENNESSEE, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

•

To
MY COLLEAGUES
IN THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
OBERLIN COLLEGE

•

PREFACE

IN HIS RECENT biography of Paul, Edgar J. Goodspeed delineates the purpose of one who would write about the apostle: "It is his task to bring [Paul] back as he moved among men, a man of vision, power and conviction, dealing with people very much like ourselves, but dealing with their problems and weaknesses with such extraordinary patience, penetration and understanding that what he said to them can still guide and instruct us, even in this late day, and teach our generation lessons of faith, tolerance, love and courage it still greatly needs to learn."¹ Paul is one of the most intriguing characters in Christian history—yes, in world history—and we of the twentieth century can learn much from him that will guide us to our high Christian destination.

Sometimes I wonder what would have happened to the Christian movement had it not been for the apostle Paul. At least nine letters of the New Testament were written by him—First and Second Thessalonians, Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Four more letters, if not from his pen, are based upon his life and thought—Ephesians, First and Second Timothy, Titus. The Gospels of Mark and Luke were written by friends who traveled with him, and who were with him in his prison days at Rome; the Gospel of John succinctly shows Paul's theological influence; the book of Acts devotes seventeen chapters to his life. Without Paul the New Testament would be a slender volume.

Paul, however, did something more than inspire or inscribe New Testament writings; he made history. There is little doubt in the minds of many religious historians that if it had not been for Paul's mission to the Gentiles, which resulted in the Jerusalem Conference in A.D. 46-47, the Christian movement would have remained primarily on Palestinian soil as a prophetic reform within Judaism. The Mediterranean world of the first century would have been meagerly evangelized to the Christian gospel, and we today might be worshipping in the Western world under some other symbol than that of the Cross.

Why do certain great personalities appear on the scene of history at the proper time with the properly balanced qualifications? How many of these personal requisites are caused by biological and environmental conditions? How much are such potentialities energized by man's response to divine guidance? How much of a role is placed in the life of such leaders by God's initiative? We can never completely discern a mathematical formula to answer these questions. From the New Testament viewpoint we can say merely: The historical scene is the locale where God and men carry on

¹ *Paul* (Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1947), p. vii.

a dialogue and an ethical adventure; the more deeply men respond with faith and repentance to God's grace, the greater seem the achievements in individual and social experience. This was true of the apostle Paul. He established numerous churches in Asia Minor and Europe, revisited these churches and contacted them with letters, kept in touch with the mother church at Jerusalem by personal visits and collected funds, and lived above discouragement though imprisoned during the last few years of his ministry. These experiences testify that God's grace working through a man of faith was standing the pragmatic test.

Paul was prepared in an all-round fashion for his ministry to the Gentiles:

1. *He was a Jew*, trained in a rabbinical school under Gamaliel at Jerusalem. He knew both the oral and the written Law; he was taught to revere the prophets. He was a Pharisee, a loyal son of the tribe of Benjamin. Had Paul lacked training as a Jew, he could not have explained the significance of Jesus to any audience, certainly not to the inquiring Gentiles.

2. *He was accustomed to Hellenistic culture*. Tarsus, his home, vied with Athens and Alexandria as one of the three great intellectual centers of his time. Paul was reared on koine Greek, though he also knew Aramaic and Hebrew. In the synagogue he had heard the Septuagint translation of Hebrew scriptures read by the rabbi in Greek. Had Paul not known Greek, which was the mode of speech throughout the Mediterranean world, his broken language would have had little effect in teaching about Jesus to potential Gentile converts. Had he been unaccustomed to Hellenistic customs, he would have found it awkward many times to adjust himself to Gentile environment.

3. *He was a Roman citizen*, possibly because of some valorous feat performed by his father or grandfather. Or was his Roman citizenship purchased by his well-to-do father? We are not certain how it was attained, but we do know that this citizenship gave him the right of protection by Roman soldiers and the right to appeal to Caesar for justice. Had Paul lacked these privileges, his ministry would probably have ended a decade sooner; and without the last ten years of Paul's ministry—in which letters to the Corinthians, the Romans, the Philippians, the Colossians, and Philemon were written, and which the alluring record about him in Acts describes—we wonder if Paul's life and teachings would have been sufficiently effective to influence later generations.

4. *Paul was a flexible religious personality*. He cared more for an inner spiritual authority than for an external one. He had great reverence for the Law—both moral and ceremonial—for Scriptures, for tradition, but like Jesus he felt the right to select those portions of legalism and scriptural interpretations which spoke to his inner salvation. Some of Paul's theology is rational, some experiential. For example, his ideas regarding the Second Coming were rationalized concepts influenced by the apocalyptic atmosphere of his time; and while such eschatological thoughts undoubtedly stimulated Paul's urgency in his apostolic endeavors, the Parousia was never experienced by Paul. On the other hand, Paul did experience salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, and from such an experiential genesis his

greatest theological ideas emerged. Like those of Friedrich Schleiermacher in the nineteenth century, Paul's theological concepts were subject to change as they currently were referred to his growing experience of God through faith in Jesus Christ.

Had Paul possessed a legalistic, sacerdotal concern as basic in religion, he would not have shifted his loyalty from the Torah to Christ as the center of salvation. But he was both a mystic and a prophet in his religious moorings; he felt the immediacy of God's Spirit in relationship to his spirit. While many pious Jews of his time cherished salvation via mediation of the Torah, Paul was dissatisfied with such a procedure—and out of this dissatisfaction his conversion to an apostle of Christ emerged. For Paul the Torah with its 613 precepts seemed too burdensome *intellectually* for one person to remember; with its 365 negative admonitions it seemed *psychologically* difficult to obey; with its norm of perfection it was *socially* and *ethically* impossible for the average person to live. Under the Torah Paul seemed like a slave under a master with rules to obey; while by faith in God through Jesus Christ, Paul felt like a son empowered with the help and love of a father.

In his rounded preparation as an apostle to the Gentiles, Paul was thus a Jew, a Hellenist, a Roman citizen, a flexible religious person. Had he lacked one of these qualifications, his mission would have been unperformed.

Paul is sometimes an enigma. At times he is difficult to grasp. Why does he appeal so deeply to meagerly educated groups of orthodox Christians? Do they understand him? Or do they find a few particular ideas in his total doctrine of salvation which brings them satisfaction? Paul is not always easy to understand, for his teachings contain both permanent and temporal suggestions. Some of his ideas have remained vital throughout nineteen centuries because they continue to speak to the unchanging needs of Christian men and women. Other of his concepts are merely first-century admonitions, which speak to a particular first-century culture. An illustration will clarify this: Several years ago I gave twelve lectures on Paul to an ecumenical laymen's school. At the conclusion of the course two women came to me and said, "We enjoyed the lectures very much, and certainly profited from them; but we still believe that women should not bob their hair, since Paul discouraged that custom." These women were right in finding value in Paul's idea of the Church for the twentieth century. They were confused, however, in not discerning the shearing of women's hair as a first-century cultural mark.

Further confusion about Paul is caused by the apocalyptic stimulus of the first century. The theology and language of an apocalyptic age, with its metaphysical dualism—God and Satan, angels and demons, natural and supernatural—its resurrection of the dead, and its cataclysmic judgment day as the key to history, left its influence on Paul's thinking, though he is not a thoroughgoing apocalypticist. When Paul speaks about marriage in First Corinthians and about the Second Coming in First and Second Thessalonians, he betrays that he is a child of an apocalyptic world—these were first-century problems. However, when he discusses the Church in Romans and

First Corinthians, or salvation by faith through Jesus Christ in Romans, or *agape* in First Corinthians, he transcends first-century influences; he utters theological concepts which belong to the centuries.

As we study Paul's letters, we need to use the religious-historical approach. Our first task is to become objective historians who live in the first century and attempt to see what Paul in his sentences is saying to the people of that time. Our second task is to return to the twentieth century and ask with care, "Which of Paul's ideas still have value for us today, because they are pragmatic and coherent?" If such a method is employed in trying to understand the meaning of Paul for today, much confusion can be avoided, and the Apostle can be retained as a helpful contemporary.

During my college and seminary days I found Paul an interesting personality to study. I viewed him with the same objective approach with which I appreciated Augustine, John Wesley, or Martin Luther, except that I paid him added deference since his writings were in the Bible. Several years after graduate-school days I began to find Paul more perplexing than helpful; I felt that he diffused rather than clearly interpreted the Christian epic. I turned instead to the Synoptic tradition as the interpretive clue to Jesus in the New Testament. But this confusion was not to last. I began to study Paul more comprehensively, to try to see more clearly why great minds like Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and Karl Barth could find him so alluring and so stimulating. My quest was not in vain, for I began to find the meaning of Paul for today, generally through reading or rereading most of the major works on Paul, but specifically through perusing the small classic by C. Harold Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for Today*.

Out of this intellectual-spiritual struggle I emerged with great admiration for both Paul the man and Paul the thinker. I began to discern many of his theological concepts as central in the Christian interpretation. Paul became one of my religious heroes. Hence, in this anthology I am sharing many selections which helped me in my religious quest, and I hope they will be of equal benefit to others.

It is my hope that through reading these definitive contemporary interpretations about Paul one can catch something of his courage, faith, hope, patience, and love for the twentieth century.

As selections were chosen to fit the outline of this anthology, several factors were obvious: (a) New Testament scholars have written few articles for biblical journals on Pauline problems during the last quarter of a century. Either scholars feel that most of the major Pauline problems have been sufficiently explored, or the scholars are uninterested in the Pauline epistles as the object of biblical criticism. (b) Many excellent books which relate Paul to the first-century religious milieu have come from the efforts of leading scholars. (c) If interest has lagged in critical problems related to Paul, he has simultaneously become the leading stimulus for contemporary theological writers. As one reads books of interpreters like Karl Barth or Emil Brunner, one finds frequent reference to the letters of Paul. Their theological patterns are centered in Pauline concepts.

From the Pauline writings the fifty-five selections of this anthology are

organized in five sections. Though different headings might have been chosen, these five seem to cover the most stimulating areas of interpretation about Paul; they comprehend quite fully the religious atmosphere where men think most deeply about him, and are broad enough to permit inclusion of selections that directly or indirectly bear upon such problems as the Church, the Incarnation, miracles, the Resurrection, the Cross, Christology, sacraments, salvation, eschatology, religious-ethical relationships in Christianity.

Here as in my other anthologies I faced the problem of selection. Various schools of New Testament interpretation and unusual and penetrating viewpoints are represented in the fellowship, with the purpose of covering with relative completeness the central Pauline problems. Some scholars could easily have been heard several times in this anthology, but in order to have a wide representation of contributors I have allowed them to speak but once. If several well-known scholars are omitted in this volume, it is because their most stimulating writings lie in non-Pauline New Testament areas. While several of the contributors, such as Weinel, Wrede, Weiss, may doubtfully be called "contemporary," their writings are included, since their influence earlier in this century has left a vital stimulus upon recent Pauline studies.

Acknowledgment is due the authors and publishers who have granted permission to reprint in this volume excerpts from their copyrighted works. Original sources are in each case indicated by a footnote and are also given in the Index of Titles. Titles in brackets are mine. The Biographical Index of Authors furnishes brief information about each writer, including a list of some of his other works and a sentence of appraisal of his interpretive position. The Bibliography suggests wider reading on Paul. It is my hope that introduction to these writers through the reading of these selections will lead many to seek fuller acquaintance with them in their complete books, and further that the rewards of such intellectual friendship will stimulate readers to seek an even wider circle of noteworthy modern thinkers about Paul.

THOMAS S. KEPLER

CONTENTS

Part I

THE RELIGIOUS ATMOSPHERE OF PAUL'S WORLD

F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON: The Gentile World	17
G. H. C. MACGREGOR and ALEXANDER C. PURDY: The Preparation in Philosophy	24
HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY: Mystery Initiation	34
EDWYN R. BEVAN: [Mystery Religions and Christianity]	42
H. A. A. KENNEDY: Relation of Paul to the Mystery-Religions	49
GEORGE F. MOORE: Character of Judaism	56
CHARLES GUIGNEBERT: The Law. The Scribes. The Synagogue	64
B. HARVIE BRANSONIB: [Jesus' Attitude Toward the Torah]	75
T. R. GLOVER: Tarsus	82
WILFRED L. KNOX: "And the Rock Was Christ"	90

Part II

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA: THE MAN AND HIS EXPERIENCE

HANS LIETZMANN: [Who Was This Paul?]	99
BENJAMIN W. BACON: Formative Influences	106
CHESTER C. McCOWN: The Sources of Pauline Mysticism	114
WILLIAM M. RAMSAY: Did Paul See Jesus?	122
RUDOLF OTTO: The Charismatic Type	128
CLARENCE T. CRAIG: The Conversion of Paul	133
EDWARD I. BOSWORTH: Paul—His Religious Experience	141
ARTHUR HOLMES: The Man Made Whole	147
JAMES MOFFATT: Pauline Chronology	157
JOHN KNOX: [The Pauline Chronology]	161
JACK FINEGAN: The Martyrdom of Paul and Peter	170

Part III

THE LETTERS OF PAUL

MARTIN DIBELIUS: Paul as a Letter Writer	177
ARTHUR D. NOCK: The Style and Thought of Paul ✓	182
R. V. G. TASKER: [Paul's Use of the Old Testament]	187
FERNAND PRAT: Paul and the Old Testament	197
EDGAR J. GOODSPEED: The First Collection of Paul's Letters	201
MAURICE GOGUEL: The Pauline Evidence	207

ALBERT E. BARNETT: The Epistle to the Ephesians	215
GEORGE S. DUNCAN: [Critical Problems Related to Galatians]	219
BURNETT H. STREETER: [The Pauline Corpus]	226
KIRSOPP C. LAKE: The Authenticity of 2 Thessalonians	234
ALBERT SCHWEITZER: The Pauline Epistles	239

Part IV

INSIGHTS INTO PAULINE THEOLOGY

ADOLF DEISSMANN: [Where Paul's Theology Begins]	249
HENRY J. CADBURY: Concurrent Phases of Paul's Religion	255
C. HAROLD DODD: The Ancient Wrong	263
KARL BARTH: Jesus	270
HARRIS F. RALL: How Paul Thought of Christ	280
FRANK C. PORTER: The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul	283
FLOYD V. FILSON: Paul and the Doctrine of Recompense	293
MORTON S. ENSLIN: The Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul	302
FRANCIS C. BURKITT: [An Ethical Anarchist]	309
VINCENT TAYLOR: The Sayings in the Pauline Narrative of the Last Supper	318
C. A. A. SCOTT: The Death of Christ as a Sacrifice	326
ANDERS NYGREN: The Agape of the Cross	333
W. H. P. HATCH: The Pauline Idea of Faith	342

Part V

MODERN EVALUATIONS OF PAUL

ERNEST F. SCOTT: [Difficulties in Paul's Religion]	355
HEINRICH WEINEL: [Paul—Stranger and Saint]	362
JOSEPH KLAUSNER: What Is Paul for the Jews?	368
J. GRESHAM MACHEN: Paul and Jesus	374
WILLIAM MORGAN: Paul and Jesus	381
WILLIAM WREDE: Paul's Importance in the History of the World	390
DONALD W. RIDDLE: Survivals	393
JOHANNES WEISS: The Theological Thinker	398
MARY E. ANDREWS: Paul, Philo, and the Intellectuals	400
AMOS N. WILDER: [The Modernizing of Paul's Message]	409

APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHY	419
BIOGRAPHICAL INDEX OF AUTHORS	423
INDEX OF TITLES	439

Part 1

THE RELIGIOUS ATMOSPHERE OF PAUL'S WORLD

THE GENTILE WORLD

F. J. Foakes-Jackson

ST. PAUL WAS a Jew and also a Roman. As the one he was able to obtain a hearing among the People of God; as the other, protection as a traveller in all parts of the civilized world.

The Roman Empire was one of the greatest political achievements of the human race, and the fact that it ever came to an end is one of the most difficult things to account for in history. It is now the fashion to disparage it, chiefly because it does not conform to our modern ideas of what a world-government should be; but with all our progress and enlightenment we have never been able to produce anything in Europe which maintained the peace, and, on the whole, the happiness of mankind for so long a period. To judge it from the standpoint of some modern writers, it never did anything but decline and fall. But considering that the world dominion of Rome began after the conclusion of the second Punic war in B.C. 202, continued to increase till the conquest of Britain in A.D. 52, that no part of it was lost till the fifth century A.D., that Constantinople or New Rome only ceased to be the seat of empire when it was taken by the Turks in 1453, and that the last ruler to claim to represent Caesar and Augustus surrendered the title of Roman Emperor in 1806, the marvel is not so much the fall as the endurance of the Roman Empire.

It is also frequently assumed that when the Empire, as we call it, was founded under a single ruler, all liberty ceased. But as regards everybody, except the Roman aristocrats and plutocrats, all that makes liberty worth having really began with the Empire. It was now possible to travel by good roads on land, and on a sea freed from pirates, to trade, to study, to correspond. Peoples were allowed to retain their ancestral religion, cities enjoyed large privileges of self-government, the inhabitants were free from compulsory military service. What citizenship means can be illustrated by an event in . . . A.D. 58.

.
A Jew was accused of profaning the Temple at Jerusalem. The priests and populace of the most turbulent city in the Roman Empire clamoured for his death. To refuse to give him up might provoke a rebellion. But he was a Roman citizen. Four hundred soldiers and seventy men mounted were requisitioned to take him in safety away from the city (Acts xviii. 23). Two years later he could boldly say to the provincial governor, "I stand at the tribunal of Caesar where I ought to be judged . . . if what these people

From *The Life of St. Paul*, New York, 1926, pp. 41-55. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Liveright Publishing Corporation (copyright 1926, Boni & Liveright, Inc.).

accuse me of is nothing, no man can give me up to them. I appeal to Caesar,' and the only answer to this was, "Thou hast appealed to Caesar: to Caesar shalt thou go" (Acts xxv. 10-12). Such were Paul's rights as a citizen of Rome. The whole of the vast power of the Empire protected him from being wronged.

Paul was, of course, a privileged person, but the way in which he probably acquired his citizenship shows how comprehensive Rome had already become. No longer was Rome a city, nor the capital of Italy; she was the whole civilized world. Her citizens were living in all countries, irrespective of their nationality; according to the Acts of the Apostles, Paul and Silas, both Jews, were citizens, and Paul says he was a Roman by birth. Claudius Lysias, in command of the troops at Jerusalem, bought his citizenship (Acts xxii. 25-29). At Philippi the inhabitants, like those of all colonies, were Romans (Acts xvi. 21). A manumitted slave could be a citizen. St. Paul, therefore, was a Roman; because his father or grandfather had purchased the privilege, or was the client of a great family, or had rendered service to the government. Paul belonged to the ruling class. He was free from the oppressions and insults to which provincials were exposed. He might not be put in bonds, or beaten or condemned to a shameful and lingering death. Paul tells us that he suffered most of the hardships of a mere provincial in his travels as an apostle; but as a Roman he had the right of appeal to the People, which in his day meant to the Emperor, who was invested with the power which had belonged to the tribunes of the plebeians. Zealous for the Law as a Jew, he also had a respect for Rome which threw over him her protecting aegis.

The Roman imperial system has been loudly condemned from the moment it was inaugurated to the present day. The Republic is supposed to have stood for liberty, the Empire for slavery, and nearly all the literature of the time was eloquent in praise of the one and condemnation of the other. Even in modern times the Roman Republic has been regarded as the embodiment of civil liberty and honest simplicity of life, and the Empire of grinding despotism and incredible luxury and vice; and, whenever an assassin has made up his mind to kill a king or president, he has flattered himself that he was imitating the austere virtue and love of liberty of Brutus, the murderer of Julius Caesar. Whatever the political merits of the ancient Republic were—and no one can deny that the system which practically abolished the distinction between the ancient patricians and plebeians and extended the citizenship in a modified form throughout Italy, without civil bloodshed, preserving Rome for centuries from internal tumult, must have possessed many virtues—still, the boasted liberty of the later Republic extended only to a few powerful political and military leaders. The imperial system of Augustus, on the other hand, by preserving the outward form of the republican constitution whilst placing all real authority in the hands of one man, was hailed by a world distracted by war with a sigh of relief. At Rome, after Augustus, no doubt, dreadful things happened, but the provinces had gained greatly by the change. Under the Republic their administration was oppressive in the extreme. A proconsul was sent to govern

one for a single year. It was impossible for him to become really acquainted with the people before his term of office was concluded. As a rule, therefore, he made hay while the sun shone, and returned to Rome with a fortune extorted from the wretched people. Augustus and his successor, Tiberius, seriously endeavoured to reform this abuse. Tiberius left the same man in the province or district for years. Josephus says that when he was asked why he did this the Emperor spoke a parable. A man bleeding and grievously wounded was covered with flies, which a benevolent stranger tried to drive away. The sufferer begged him to desist because the flies on him were satiated, and if new ones came they would be hungry and only increase his torment. Tiberius meant that a newly-appointed governor usually had a keener appetite for plunder than a man who had been in office for some time. But even under the worst emperors the Roman tradition, which, with all its harshness, had respect for law and order, was maintained and the greater part of the world enjoyed the advantage of a firm and established government.

Not only so, but a certain amount of freedom was allowed and even encouraged. No one can read the Acts of the Apostles without seeing that almost every city had its own government and officials. Thessalonica had its "rulers of the city" (*politarchs*), Ephesus its "town clerk" (*grammateus*) or scribe, Jerusalem its Sanhedrin under the High Priest, and for a short time a king of Judea (Agrippa I). One has only to consult a map of the Near East to see that native rulers abounded. In Asia Minor there was a Kingdom of Polemo, and a Kingdom of Commagene, in Northern Syria a little Kingdom of Chalcis ruled by one of the Herods. There were also petty rulers called *ethnarchs*, or *tetrarchs*, and priestly rulers of territories belonging to Temples as the High Priest in Judaea had once been. The policy of leaving native potentates to administer their kingdoms under Roman protection had been adopted by Pompey the Great, and was not wholly dissimilar to the arrangement of British India with its native states. In fact, the Romans allowed the people to govern themselves provided they remained at peace and caused no disturbance. We do not hear of any of Paul's labours outside the provinces directly subject to Roman authority.

It was customary to represent the Roman world of St. Paul's age as utterly corrupt. This was due to the fact that the sole source of information was the picture drawn by the moralists, including St. Paul, the historians, and the satirists of the time. But if modern life in fashionable circles is to be judged only by unfavourable reports would it fare much better? To judge of a society by the scandals about its rulers, and the degrading amusements provided for the corrupt populace of the large cities, is manifestly unfair; and now we know more of the life of the people, especially of the middle classes, from inscriptions and the Egyptian papyri we have to revise this judgment. Still commonsense would prevent the belief that the average member of society lived an entirely abnormal life. We read in the contemporary literature about the excesses, often bestial, the follies and the luxury of men and women intoxicated by their power and wealth, but the inscriptions and papyri show that the ordinary folk had their little clubs

and fraternities, exhibited much domestic affection, carried on the business of life, kept their accounts and wrote more or less illiterate letters to their friends and relations. At the same time fear of exaggeration must not conceal the fact that society in every heathen city was more corrupt than where people are even professedly Christian, and that ancient life had some very repulsive aspects which are happily absent from our own.

Religion in the Roman Empire bore at least some resemblance to that of the present day. The government was tolerant of private opinion of the subject, and of practices which were not inconvenient to good order. Provided people did not interfere with the religion of the state, they might worship much as they pleased, and few were satisfied with what was officially practised. They preferred something which appealed to them as individuals. There was a perfect passion for cults, mostly oriental in origin, which inspired the imagination, or promised the knowledge of secrets unknown to ordinary mortals. The worship of Cybele with its priesthood and its baptism of blood came from Asia Minor; that of Isis with its impressive ritual, from Egypt; later, that of Mithras appealed by its secrecy and its ascending scale of initiations. But the most popular attraction was in the so-called "mystery religions." Both men and women were initiated into the mysteries or secrets of some divinity. As a rule, the "mystery" turned on death and life, and the initiates were subjected to some test of their fortitude before they were admitted. Often the story was represented in dramatic form. Those who had passed the test and learned the secrets formed a fraternity, and probably met for a common meal. This some consider to have had a very important bearing on the work of St. Paul, as it is a much debated point whether he did not borrow from the mysteries for his doctrine of the Christian Sacraments. Was his interpretation of Baptism as being a death and burial followed by a resurrection with Christ to a new life, due to an unconscious adaptation of what he had been told about the heathen mysteries? The same may also be asked about the Lord's Supper.

One form of religion which appears very strange and repugnant to us, and yet, if explained, is easily accounted for, was the worship of the ruling Caesar. It is difficult for us to understand how men could regard a mortal as a supernatural being, and pay him divine honours, yet it is common in almost all primitive stages of society. Still it does seem strange that in a highly civilized world men should gravely believe that the Emperor was divine. Yet something very similar is said to have happened in India when the native soldiers of General John Nicholson (d. 1857) began to worship him as a god. Horrified at such honours being paid him, the general ordered his worshippers to be flogged, but this evidence of his power and wrath only made them pay him more respect. It was somewhat the same with the Emperor Augustus. The more he showed his dislike to divine honour, the more the provincials desired to worship him. Was this altogether unnatural? Rome (the Greek word *rômê* means power) was not only a power to be dreaded, but an object of gratitude: to Rome the people owed the peace of the world, and Caesar was to them the embodiment of Rome.

The cultus was strictly not of the Emperor himself, but of the *Genius*

(Greek *tyché*—fortune) of Rome, and neither Julius Caesar nor any living Emperor, except Tiberius, was worshipped in Italy, where deceased emperors by decree of the Senate were enrolled among the gods with the title of *divus*, a practice which has an analogy with Christian canonization. In the provinces, however, in all parts of the Roman dominion, “colleges” of priests were organized for the worship of Caesar. This had an important bearing on the spread of Christianity, as well as on the fortunes of Judaism. The Emperor Caius, better known as Caligula (A.D. 37-41), gave orders that his statue should be placed in the Temple of Jerusalem, to the horror of the Jews throughout the world; and their objection was ignorantly interpreted by the government as a sign of disloyalty. Later, Christians suffered for refusing to swear by the *genius* of Caesar, their refusal being considered to be a proof of disaffection. Both Jews and Christians declared that they either sacrificed, or prayed for the welfare of Caesar. On the other hand, the elaborated hierarchy organized for the purpose of the Imperial cultus, may have been unconsciously copied by the Christians in organizing the churches under their own leaders or bishops, especially as the episcopal system is supposed to have originated in Asia. The world in St. Paul’s day with its Gentile background resembled in some ways our own. (1) It was cosmopolitan; (2) it was full of great cities; (3) distinguished for its grandiose rather than great achievements; (4) for the enormous wealth of individuals and the rise of new men to power and influence; (5) the people more and more looked to the state for maintenance; (6) side by side with much brutality there was a growing feeling in favour of more humanity; (7) scepticism was giving way to a desire for religion, though the old faiths were becoming discredited.

(1) The Romans complained that their city was no longer inhabited by natives even of Italy, just as today New Yorkers say that theirs is no longer American. When St. Paul wrote to the “Romans,” even if he could have sent a Latin letter, his correspondents probably would not have been able to read it. Greek was widely spoken in the imperial household as well as the crowded quarters of the city. In the streets one would see every type of oriental face, and men of every race—African, Gauls, Spaniards, even British. The satirist Juvenal complained that Rome was in his day, a generation later than Paul’s, not Roman, but Greek, and also that the native population had been swamped by Syrian immigrants. It was the same everywhere, nationalities were annihilated by the world being under a single government and by the consequent ease with which people were able to transplant themselves. This was one of the means by which a universal religion had become possible as it never had been before.

(2) Another symptom of the change which had come over the Roman world, as it has over ours, is that people no longer desired to live in the country. The poets sang in praise of the life of the farmer, and the rich built country houses and indulged in gardens and amateur farming, but the population crowded into the towns. The population of Rome cannot be determined, but some have placed it at two millions. Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage, and other cities may each have had a million or more crowded

within their walls. The countryside was well-nigh deserted, and the great cities had to import their food from overseas. Most of the labour was done by vast gangs of slaves; and the freemen were often unemployed and looked for food and entertainment being supplied by the rich, so that their idle classes were recruited alike from the wealthy and unemployed, and the industrious middle-class was gradually disappearing. Among these people the Christian religion made headway and probably one of its attractions was the simple and laborious life which it encouraged. When Paul worked with his own hands he did almost as much to advance the Gospel as by his sermons and letters. City life, however, with its many disadvantages, at least brought men together and contributed to the spread of Christianity. In later times it was the countryman *paganus* who adhered to the earlier religions.

(3) Another characteristic of the Roman world was the desire to do things on a large scale. Josephus tells us that one of the great causes of Pontius Pilate's unpopularity with the Jews was that he used the treasures of the Temple at Jerusalem to construct a great aqueduct to supply the city with water. Many today would sympathize with Pilate. Water was the supreme need necessary for the health of the people. The treasury of the Temple was full to overflowing and Pilate resolved to employ some of the surplus, not for his own advancement, but for the public benefit. The Jews regarded this as profane (*Antiq.* Bk. xviii. iii. 2). Roman commonsense was opposed to religious zeal and a serious riot followed. But the incident is instructive. We see in it an example of the practical but unsympathetic good sense of the Roman, opposed to the idealism of the Jew. The characteristic of the Roman rule was that it was occupied entirely with this world, and even its religion and its gods stood for civil virtue and the material objects of life. Paul and all associated with him, even his personal opponents, were against this conception of society. Yet the immense buildings and works of the Romans command our admiration. The wonderful system of sewerage which protected the health of Rome, the arches spanning the valleys to sustain the pipes which brought pure water from afar, the huge baths and amphitheatres, the ruins of which still survive in cities in every part of the ancient empire, the paved roads which were constructed over hill and dale, often for many miles in a straight line, the magnificent harbours, are all proofs that the government was one of the most practical this world has ever witnessed. Nevertheless, Rome lacked the lofty idealism which men like St. Paul afterwards laboured to create by propagating the religion of the Christ. Truly, the Apostle could say when he lived among these stupendous efforts to secure permanence, "The fashion of this world passeth away."

(4) The days of St. Paul were marked by the concentration of great wealth in the hands of individuals. The Roman from the earliest days was avaricious: the first domestic troubles in Rome were due to the savage cruelty with which the patricians exacted payment of the debts of their plebeian fellow-citizens. It was the same in the later days of the Republic except that the distinction was not between a privileged aristocracy and the people, but, as now, between rich and poor. In St. Paul's day immense

fortunes were made; but the most successful "millionaires" were often men of the humblest origin. The freedman was the butt of the satirists of society. Slaves were often highly educated and were employed to manage their master's affairs, often greatly to their own personal advantage. Thus we have the extraordinary anomaly of slavery reducing some to abject misery, and at the same time enabling others to become the financial masters of the world. But on the whole, covetousness was the besetting sin of the age, and was the subject of the solemn warning of the Master, "Take heed and beware of covetousness," and of Paul, who said, "Covetousness which is idolatry."

(5) Another interesting parallel between St. Paul's time and the state of Europe, especially England at present, is that the people looked to the government to maintain them. Crowded into great cities, they depended on free distribution of corn and food generally, and demanded entertainment at the public cost. To prevent disturbances it was necessary to keep large idle crowds fed and amused. What was condemned by moralists as the profuse extravagance of the emperors had often policy behind it. Taxation became increasingly heavy, population decreased because the industrious could not look forward to a secure maintenance of their children. Family life was disappearing owing to this and the increasing selfishness of the age, and good men looked to the future with apprehension.

(6) Despite the unquestionable grossness and brutality of the Roman Empire in the first century of our era, there was a growing tendency to greater humanity. Moralists like Seneca, who exhibits many sentiments resembling those of Paul, showed a disposition to recognize the right of slaves to a treatment far less severe than that sanctioned by the law. Some of the best men openly showed their horror of the gladiatorial combats. The great lawyers began to recognize that the entire human race—even slaves—had rights as men. In short, the old Roman sternness was gradually though almost imperceptibly yielding to kindlier feelings toward mankind, and the Christian idea was not entirely opposed to the best feelings of the time.

(7) Lastly, the age was a religious one. In the later days of the Republic the old religion was losing its hold and nothing was taking its place. Epicurean atheism was fashionable, the heathen priesthoods scoffed at the rites they were celebrating. But when Augustus became supreme he encouraged a religious revival; and under his successors it became evident that the vast majority needed some religious help though men knew not where to look for it. Christianity came to supply them with a pressing want.

In such a world Jesus Christ appeared with a message from God, which He delivered in a tiny province of the world-Empire. How St. Paul carried this message throughout all lands in the face of incredible difficulty, persecution, and danger must be the theme of every attempt to write his life.

THE PREPARATION IN PHILOSOPHY

G. H. C. Macgregor and Alexander C. Purdy

WHAT HAS THE Christian to do with the philosopher?" asks the bigoted Tertullian, to which Clement makes the rejoinder that philosophy is God's "special covenant with the Greeks as a basis for the philosophy according to Christ," while Christianity itself is "the genuinely true philosophy"; and the consensus of the early apologists is with him in recognizing that Christianity can compel assent only when it is exhibited in the setting of a comprehensive philosophy intelligible to thinking men in each new age. It is the supreme service of Greece to have provided such a setting.

The earliest Greek philosophers—Thales, Pythagoras, Xenophanes, Heraclitus, and their fellows—were primarily physicists, and it is only with Socrates that the main line of inquiry is diverted from the nature of matter to human nature itself, from physics to ethics, from the mechanism of the universe to the determination of good and evil in human conduct. Socrates may be said to be the discoverer of Conscience, "the wife from whom there is no divorce," and it is in fact to him and his immediate followers that Christianity owes those fundamental conceptions of right and wrong, within which the educated conscience still moves when confronted with an ethical alternative. In this brief study of the preparation of Christianity in Greek philosophy we can trace only the main streams; the lesser tributaries we must, perforce, leave unexplored.

I. PLATONISM

The foremost exponent of Socratic ideas was Plato; and above all other philosophers he has exercised the most potent influence upon Christianity, and that not only directly but indirectly, for Platonism penetrated every later system, in particular Stoicism and Neo-Platonism, and through them redoubled its influence on Christianity itself. Of this the early Apologists were very conscious. According to Justin Martyr "the teachings of Plato are not different from the teachings of Christ," and he confesses that it was while "delighting in the teachings of Plato" that he himself, through the witness of Christian martyrs, was won for Christ. The abiding influence of Platonism may perhaps be summarized under the following propositions:—

(a) *The "Ideas."*

Fundamental is Plato's theory of knowledge and reality. Socrates had argued that only the knowledge of "concepts" guarantees a true knowledge; Plato takes the next step by maintaining that true being belongs only to that

From *Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ*, New York, 1936, pp. 239-58. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons.

which is thought in concepts, that is to the "ideas." Whereas all that the senses perceive is subject to ceaseless change, that and that alone which is inaccessible to the senses and known by thought only may be permanent, consistent, eternal. We must therefore learn to distinguish the unchangeable originals of things, the "ideas," which alone have true being, from their appearance as objects of sense. Plato thus flung out an anchor of hope to bewildered men drifting under the puzzling and depressing sense of uncertainty and instability inherent in that doctrine, so dear to the ancient physicists, of the flux of all things. His message will never lose its power so long as man wrestles with the problem of the transient and the eternal; and it was a Christian Apostle who gave to it its most concise statement, when he declared that "the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not are eternal."

(b) *The "Good."*

Equally important is Plato's insistence on the ultimate reality of the Good. All his "ideas" stand in a definite progressive relation to one another, and the supreme apex is reached in what is called "the idea of the Good." All that is in the world is as it is because it is best so; and therefore it is only really conceived when it is referred to the Good as its final object. Thus it is the idea of Good which gives both to the Universe its reality and to man his capacity for knowledge. And this idea of Good as the absolute ground of all being, becomes for Plato coincident with the Deity. Thus Plato puts goodness on the throne of the universe as being both the source and the goal of the whole world-process, and sees in the attainment of goodness the supreme quest of all things. As for man, he is a "plant of heavenly origin," and can attain to his true being only in the knowledge of that goodness which is the ultimate reality: as another great Christian prophet would put it, "This is life eternal to know Thee, the only Real God."

(c) *Rational Monotheism.*

Though Plato never actually raises the question of the personality of God, by this insistence upon the Good, as coincident with the Deity and the absolute ground of all being, he provides the philosophic basis for a rational monotheism, a gift which, when combined with the ethical and personalistic monotheism of the Old Testament, was of inestimable value to Christianity. The influence upon early Christian theology of the Platonic doctrine of the supreme idea of the Good manifesting itself in the Divine Reason (Logos) is readily traceable in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, and is still more evident in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Augustine.

(d) *Platonic Ethics.*

In the realm of ethics Plato owes everything to Socrates. The basis of all true virtue is knowledge; to do right without knowledge is impossible: not to do right is equally impossible if what is right is truly known. All

virtues are thus in a sense one: yet, because to each of the principal virtues belongs a special place in the soul, with this unity of virtues Plato can combine a plurality of virtues, the chief of which are four. *Wisdom* consists in the right quality of the reason: *courage* is the outcome of reason's verdict on what is and is not to be feared: *self-control* is the unanimity of each part of the soul on the question which is to command and which obey: *justice* is the total effect of such a harmonious relationship, when each part of the soul fulfils and does not overstep its own peculiar function. As for the soul itself, its true home is in the world beyond the senses, whereas the body with its sensual life is but its prison-house and grave. To fulfil his mission man must escape the material world and become assimilated to the divine; for it is the rule of the divine reality within us that can alone make us rich and free. Again we hear the Christian echo: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. . . . Ye must be born again. . . . Ye shall know the truth, and the truth will make you free."

(e) *Immortality.*

For Plato the soul is inherently and intrinsically immortal, for the basis of the soul is reason, and reason is indestructible. Yet it is an impersonal immortality, for this immortal basis of the soul enters one new-born babe after the other, and has nothing to do with individual character and personality, which are developed by each individual in the course of his life and pass away at his death—a doctrine as far removed as possible from the Christian hope of immortality, and the cause of not a little misunderstanding between Paul and his Pagan converts. Primitive Christianity, of course, based its hope of unending life on the Person and death and resurrection of Jesus and the individual union of the Christian with him. But as Christianity expanded into its Hellenistic environment the need was felt for additional philosophic arguments; and it was chiefly to Plato that the Church turned.

(f) *Rational Religion.*

But possibly the richest bequest of Platonism was the secret that the keenest intellectual search after truth may be combined with a religious and devotional contemplation of truth itself, and conversely that the religion of rational and intelligent beings must at least be reasonable and intelligible, something to which the intellect as well as the emotions may pay homage. Paul was a true Platonist when he insisted that a valid religious experience is not restricted to exceptional ecstatic individuals, or to be confounded with abnormal non-moral emotional phenomena, but belongs to all those and only to those who are prepared to lay upon the altar of God both the intellect and the emotions: "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also. . . . I had rather speak five words with my understanding . . . than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (1 Cor. xiv, 15, 19). As Thomas Traherne puts it, "he who thinks well serves God in the innermost court."

II. THE CYNICS

Of the lesser Socratic schools the most interesting is that of the Cynics, founded by Antisthenes, an older contemporary of Plato, and made famous by the eccentric Diogenes. Antisthenes, who set up his school in Kynosarges, the gymnasium of the base-born, where he developed a vividly parabolic and emotional type of preaching, is generally credited with having originated the literary form known as *διατριβή*, which in turn is the prototype of the Christian *ὁμιλία*, a homily or sermon. Diogenes, the son of a money-changer who had been imprisoned for fraud, made it his aim in life, as he put it, to "deface the coinage," to reject all conventional stamps and evaluations as so much base metal with lying superscriptions. Only "virtue" herself is good, and for the Cynic, unlike Plato, virtue is largely a matter of action, and does not require either many words or much knowledge. If happiness is to be found only in "virtue," then virtue itself consists chiefly in a state of independence from externals and freedom from unnecessary "needs." Man's salvation lies in a return to nature: let him live like the beasts "a dog's life," like primitive men who do not vex their hearts with imaginary sins and artificial conventions. Let him face the hard buffetings of fortune in the conviction that it is better to fight for the right and fall having done your best, than to share the victory and prosperity of the unjust; and at the end let him face the uncertain future with the "cynical" optimism of the great sage himself: "Bury me," said Diogenes, "face downwards, for everything is soon going to be turned the other way up." The Cynic's lasting contribution is that he stands as the permanent type of one way of wrestling with life's terrors, namely to face them as would a soldier a long and arduous campaign, holding on to his morals in the face of bewildering defeat, and counting the doing of his Duty as his true and only prize.

III. ARISTOTLE AND THE PERIPATETICS

Very different was the turn given to Platonic thought by Aristotle and the Peripatetics, to whom above all other schools posterity is indebted for the preservation of that characteristic quality of Hellenism, which else was in some danger of suffering eclipse, the love and pursuit of truth for its own sake. Amidst the ecstasies of one school, and the self-suppressions of another, Aristotle exercised a steadying influence by the calm and essentially Hellenic *sophrosune* of his temper. His school was one which accepted the world as it is and tried to understand it, instead of either rejecting it as beneath the wise man's contempt, or conjuring up some Utopia into which it might be transformed. For two things in particular Christian theology is Aristotle's debtor—his extraordinary skill in creating a philosophical terminology, and his assumption that truth is never static and that further seeking will not only increase but correct our knowledge. Though his interests are essentially philosophic rather than religious, the quest of the intellect after truth rather than the yearning of the heart for salvation, Aristotle nevertheless profoundly influenced the development of religious thought. His contemptuous rejection of anthropomorphic mythology, his courageous effort to harmonize religion and science in a higher synthesis,

his magnificent conception of the Deity or First Cause as unmoved itself while moving all the universe "as the beloved moves the lover"—all this stamps him as a great religious teacher, and one to be numbered among our "tutors unto Christ."

IV. THE TEACHING OF THE STOICS

A familiar story tells how a certain philosopher, after studying in the Peripatetic school, went and sat at the feet of Chrysippus the Stoic, and was amazed to find himself in a new world: "It was like turning from men to Gods." For, as Zeller has well said, "Stoicism is not only a system of philosophy, but also a system of religion." And here it is that, for good or evil, we see most clearly the influence of Hellenistic philosophy upon the Christian Gospel. In Stoicism we have one of the strongest cultural links between Greece proper and Rome, for though the founders of the school—Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus—flourished in Athens, it exercised its greatest influence and found its richest expression among the Romans, to whose dour, unspeculative nature its teaching was peculiarly congenial; for Stoicism is essentially more akin to the Puritanism of the Cynics than to the idealism and intellectualism of Plato and Aristotle. Again we shall summarize under six main propositions:

(a) *Physics.*

The Stoic system of physics, in contrast to Platonic idealism, is a thorough-going materialism, which may be traced back to Heraclitus, according to whom there is no principle in the universe but matter, and only the corporeal is real. Nevertheless, the Stoics distinguished between matter itself and the forces at work in it, between the passive principle which is created and directed and the active principle which is the creative force. The latter they identified with "reason" which as *logos spermatikos* is immanent in all things as a formative and life-giving power. Yet even this, like all that is real, is in a sense corporeal, and is characterized as *pneuma*, warm vapour or fire, through which as the operative principle in the universe the creative reason expresses itself. In the process of the world's formation this fiery vapour, in which creative reason is immanent, is transformed first into air and then into water, whence finally the earth is precipitated; and when the present world has run its course, a final conflagration will transform all things once more into a mass of fiery vapour, whence once more a new world will emerge, to be followed at the behest of an inexorable necessity by an infinite succession of worlds exactly similar in every minutest detail, linked together in an unescapable chain of cause and effect, and moving onwards in an endless circle of birth and destruction.

(b) *Theology.*

By this doctrine of the immanence in all things of creative reason the Stoics brought together once more the material world and the ideal world which Plato had set asunder, and by asserting the unity of the final cause

prepared the way for the recognition in the world of a single divine principle. The Theology of the Stoics is directly dependent on their physics. For in the supreme creative Power—conceived of in their material terminology as a fifth element or divine fire, and named variously Zeus, Destiny, Providence, Universal Law, Nature—they recognized God, in the Hymn of the religious Cleanthes a God who can be certainly worshipped and almost loved and trusted: “For neither for mortals nor for gods is there greater gift than justly to hymn the Universal Law for ever.” To the world, to whom He gives its life and its properties and its movement, the Deity stands in the relation of soul to body. Thus we have a theology of immanence, which in the development of religious ideas is a valuable offset to the transcendental views of Plato and Aristotle. Says Seneca of God: “We understand Jove to be ruler and guardian of the whole, mind and breath of the Universe, lord and artificer of this fabric. . . . He it is whose thought provides for the universe that it may move on its course unhurt and do its part. . . . He it is of whom all things are born, by whose breath we live. . . . He himself is this whole that you see, fills his own parts, sustains himself and what is his.” As for man, since he too is part of the cosmos, God the world-reason is immanent in him, and as Epictetus says he is a “fragment of God,” even a “son of God,” or according to Horace “a little portion of divine breath”—thoughts which Paul echoes in Athens, “for we are also His offspring” (Acts xvii, 28). Hence, as Seneca writes to his friend Lucilius: “God is near you, with you, within you; a holy Spirit sits within us, watcher of our good and evil deeds, and guardian over us”—and then, quoting Virgil,

What God we know not, yet a God there dwells.

Characteristic too is Stoic determinism. If the Stoics did not actually coin the word Providence, it was certainly they who put it into general circulation. Let the vulgar believe that blind Chance ruled the world: for the Stoic all was Order, Law, Fate. Yet it was an all-wise Fate, and that which it decreed for man was best for him, for the God of whose design the universe was the product made the laws which ruled it, Himself obeyed those laws, and summed them up in that universal law which was really Himself. Yet this doctrine, lofty though it was, suffered alike from a vagueness about God and a pessimism about man. “I put myself in the hands of a Stoic,” writes Justin Martyr, “and I stayed a long time with him, but when I got no further in the matter of God—for he did not know himself and he used to say that this knowledge was not necessary—I left him.” There is the characteristic weakness of a theology of immanence which denies true personality to God and man alike. And as for man, Stoicism is at heart incurably pessimistic. A philosophy of the moral aristocracy, it thought of the mass of men as in this world incapable of rising far above the brute, and in the world to come destined merely to be merged in that divine fiery essence of which their souls were sparks, to be born again and yet again in a hopeless succession of identical reincarnations. The Stoic was left with not even an illusion as to the moral progress of the ages.

(c) *The Secret of Happiness.*

The founder of Stoicism was first led to philosophy by the necessity of finding a basis for his moral life, and ethics never ceased to be central for the School, its main aim being to make men happy and self-sufficient by the practice of virtue. "Of the subjects of philosophical investigation," writes Aristo of Chios, "some concern us, some have no relation to us, some are beyond our reach; ethics is of the first class, logic and dialectic of the second, physics of the third." The secret of happiness is to "live consistently with nature"; but it must be confessed that this "life according to nature" appears often as the vaguest of generalities, covering what one might term now Naturalism, now Realism, now even a crude Animalism. To grasp the highest Stoic thought we need a definition of "Nature." "In the world we can see a moving Purpose. It is '*Phusis*,' the word which the Romans unfortunately translated '*Natura*,' but which means 'growing' or 'the way things grow'—almost what we call Evolution. But to the Stoic it is a living and conscious evolution, a forethought or *πρόνοια* in the mind of God, what the Romans called '*providentia*,' guiding all things that grow in a direction which accords with the Divine will."¹ Hence the way to be happy is to go in the direction of the Divine will, to desire what God wills to give you, just as unhappiness usually arises from the desire of something which you cannot acquire. This is to "live according to nature," for in the last analysis nature is God. Here too is the motive for that characteristic steeling of the heart against the blows of an apparently unkind fate. Even such a decree is all-wise, and nothing better could have happened; for the supreme Power, Providence, Nature is not only all-wise but all-virtuous, and what it decrees is best. "The end of life," says Diogenes Laertius, "is to act in conformity with nature, that is, at once with the nature which is in us and with the nature of the universe. . . . Thus the life according to nature is that virtuous and blessed flow of existence, which is enjoyed only by one who always acts so as to maintain the harmony between the daemon within the individual and the will of the Power that orders the universe." Such is the ideal happiness which the world with all its pleasures, sorrows and accidents can neither give nor take away.

(d) *Ethics in General.*

Upon this central doctrine Stoic ethics in general are based. Special emphasis is placed upon the exercise of the will, that man may set himself resolutely to live in obedience to Reason and in accord with Nature. To such things as are not under the control of his will he must be entirely indifferent—even to the love of his child or the death of those dearest to him. Only in the attainment of such *ἀπάθεια* does happiness lie. Says Epictetus: "Externals are not within my power; choice is. Where then shall I seek good and evil? Why, within, in what is my own." "If you wish good, get it from yourself." "For from within comes ruin, and from within comes help." Hence too the stress laid upon the duty of constant self-

¹ Gilbert Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 126.

examination. "Never let sleep come to thy languid eyes e'er thou hast considered each act of the day . . . and then chide thyself for thy shameful acts, rejoice over thy good"; thus again Epictetus, quoting lines which he attributes to Pythagoras. And the only judge of what is shameful and what is good is the inner light of conscience, "the Holy Spirit within us." Indeed, conscience and duty may be said to be the twin corner-stones of Stoic ethics. Paul speaks as a Stoic when he compares life to a fight to be fought or a race to be run. Life as military service is a favourite metaphor; to each man, as in an army, a special duty is assigned, and he must go into training that he may be fit to face whatever life may bring. Above all, to the soldier it does not matter whether on his particular part of the field there is victory or defeat: what does matter is that he should obey the orders of conscience and do his best.

(e) *Social Ethics.*

While the Stoic's ethics in general tend to make him self-sufficient and independent of all things external, yet his social ethics aim at cultivating those duties which arise out of his relation to that larger whole of which he is a part, and by performance of which he will qualify as a good citizen of the world. "You must live for others," says Seneca, "if you wish to live for yourself." For, self-sufficient as he was, the Stoic yet felt himself a part of the universal whole and akin by nature to all rational beings. This kinship to humanity transcends any mere national ties, so that the Stoic becomes the prophet of cosmopolitanism. Two states are to be distinguished, that to which a man belongs by birth and "that true commonwealth where dwell both gods and men," so that Marcus Aurelius can declare: "To me as Antonius my city is Rome, but as a man it is the universe." Moreover, as in each man alike there is a fragment of the divine, all men are equal and distinctions of rank are of no account. True, the Stoic was practical enough to see that such equality is only theoretical; as Chrysippus puts it, nothing can prevent some seats in the theatre being better than others, and no more can all men have equal opportunities. Yet even as a theory the doctrine of man's equality is one of the chief bequests of Stoicism to posterity. "All of us," says Seneca, "have the same origin, the same source; no man is nobler than another except him who has a more upright character and one better fitted to honourable pursuits." It has often been noted as typical that the two most significant figures of second century Stoicism are Epictetus the slave and Marcus Aurelius the Emperor. When Paul writes such passages as Gal. iii, 28, or Col. iii, 11, it must be confessed that his spirit is more akin to the Stoic gospel of universal humanity than to the narrow Jewish provincialism of his fellow-apostles: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

(f) *The Stoic Sage.*

The Stoic ideal may be summed up in the picture of the perfect sage, who is thus described by Cicero: "Dignified, magnificent, consistent, since

reason declares that moral good is the only good, he alone must be happy; ... rightly will all things be said to be his who alone knows their use; rightly too will he be styled beautiful, since the lineaments of the soul are more beautiful than those of the body; rightly is he alone free, under the domination of no one and obeying no appetite; rightly is he invincible whose body may be fettered but whose soul is not to be enchained." In his quest after such an ideal the seeker is bidden select some noble character—a Socrates, a Cato, a Scipio—as his mentor: "We ought to choose some good man," says Seneca, "and always have him before our eyes, that we may live as if he watched us, and do everything as if he saw." Yet, practical as ever, he is under no illusion as to the impossibility of attaining to the ideal: "Enough for me to take away daily something from my faults and daily to reject my errors." It is easy to see under what a disadvantage Stoicism laboured that it could not point to its ideal incarnate, as could Christianity in the historical Jesus. When the Stoic could only ask despairingly, "Where is he to be found whom we have sought so many ages?" the Christian could point to "the Logos made flesh."

Even though many of our illustrations have been drawn from post-Christian writers, it may be fairly claimed that they do no more than bring to its richest expression the Stoicism in the midst of which Gentile Christianity took its rise; and we have dealt at greater length with the ideals of this school, because they awaken so many echoes in the pages of the New Testament. No less than the influence of Platonism on Christian theology has been that of Stoicism on Christian ethics. Yet we must never overlook a fundamental difference between Stoicism and Christianity, both in motive and in their view of the mutual relation of man to man. Stoicism is essentially self-centred and its aim is self-sufficiency, while the driving force of Christianity is self-sacrifice. As Bevan admirably puts it: "I think it is important to realize that mankind has two different ideals before it; and I do not see how the ideal of Detachment is compatible with the ideal of Love."

V. THE EPICUREAN SCHOOL

The rival school of the Epicureans may be dealt with much more briefly, for its influence on the world in general and Christianity in particular was far less. Like the Stoics, Epicurus, who was born in Samos in 341 B.C., renounced the world with all its conventions and passions and inequalities; but while the Stoic preached that even in a cruel and wicked world man can by strength of will be virtuous, Epicurus insisted that he can even be happy. The secret is to cease torturing oneself with illusory hopes and phantom fears; and first one must be rid of the dread of this world, which after all is merely a machine, neither made nor guided by divine design but merely by certain mechanical principles. To this end Epicurus revived the physical theory of Democritus, according to which the world was formed by the clashing of atoms as they fall in a ceaseless rain through the void. Furthermore, by giving to the atoms a rudimentary power of movement, which enabled them to swerve and thereby clash, he attained a two-fold

object: he both left room for Free Will, and he could also dispense with the idea of divine assistance at the creation. Not even mind or reason is required as a causative force, for all is the result of a purely mechanical process. He thus claimed to set men free from the shackles of fatalism, and above all to deliver them, as Lucretius puts it, from the "burden of religion." Yet Epicurus did not deny the existence of gods, if only because he clung to the dream that somewhere there must exist beings who embodied that ideal of happiness which he could not find on earth. But if they do exist, they neither care for man nor concern themselves with this world, but live in the bliss of complete freedom from disturbance by mundane affairs; and in a similar *ataraxia* or "undisturbedness" or freedom from worry man will find the happiness which he seeks. Though Epicurus frankly taught that happiness or pleasure (he loves the word *ἡδονή*, "sweetness") is the goal of human effort and desire, he cannot fairly be accused of "hedonism": the active pursuit of pleasure as an end in itself, especially of sensual pleasure, will rob the soul of its perfect repose. Let a man rather conquer his fears and his restlessness, and the essential "sweetness" of life will inevitably reveal itself. Thus the Epicurean ideal is a passive rather than an active pleasure, freedom from passion, desire, pain rather than positive happiness and fullness of life. Indeed it is a not unfair reproach against the school that, while the Stoic bade man be of good cheer and overcome the world, the Epicurean preached a mere doctrine of escape. So positive a faith as Christianity was not likely to owe much to so nerveless a philosophy.

In earlier days Greek philosophy had sought to divorce itself from religion, but by the New Testament era it was seeking increasingly to renew the alliance. The teaching of every school had become centrally moral and religious; whatever concessions might be made to popular polytheism, the greater systems all agreed in regarding the Divine as one; and, whether it be Plato stressing the transcendence of God or the Stoics His immanence, each school was contributing to the development of a rounded theology. In the matter of ethics again the various systems agreed that a man's own personality is his one inalienable possession, and that moral responsibility rests upon the individual—doctrines entirely consonant with the Christian ethic. But philosophy alone was not enough. If the most priceless gift of Greek religious genius to the race is its confidence that human reason can by seeking find out even God, its most obvious weakness is its neglect of the converse truth that God is ever actively seeking and finding man. For by philosophy alone, even by the practice of "virtue" under the direction of "reason" and the control of the will, man can never attain his quest. Even the Stoic in the end admitted it: "No man," says Seneca, "is good without God. Can anyone rise superior to fortune save with God's help?"

MYSTERY INITIATION

Harold R. Willoughby

THE PERSONAL transformation which was the initial feature of cult mysticism had its ethical as well as its religious aspect, and this responded to a demand of the age for a blend of ethics and religion. It is somewhat difficult to define the ethical interests of gentile religionists in the first century, for the early imperial period was a time of great moral disorder and confusion, paralleling the stress and strain in other areas of life. This moral anarchy is comprehensible, for it grew out of the same social conditions that determined religious developments in this period. In the *polis* of Hellenic days, political, moral, and religious duties were all integrated, and the citizen found sufficient guidance for the performance of his obligations in community institutions, ancestral customs, and state laws. These had divine sanction for him and no other authority was needed. With the wrecking of that corporate life, however, morals were divorced from politics and the individual was left to himself without external authority to guide his conduct. The continuous social upheavals of Hellenistic and republican times, the free mingling of populations in commerce and conquest, and the enormous increase of slavery furthered the process of cutting thousands of human beings loose from moral restraints. No wonder men were groping after new norms for the conduct of life at this time!

It is ordinarily assumed that society in the middle of the first century was conspicuously lacking in ethical interests and had sunk to the lowest point of moral degradation. This impression is gained chiefly from two sources, from Jewish and Christian writers on the one hand and from Roman satirists on the other. Obviously, however, the former were prejudiced witnesses from the start, and the latter confined themselves to a one-sided view of only one class in Roman society. When the student turns aside from such biased and limited views to consider the general trend in society as a whole, he discovers that it was not only a period of moral anarchy but of ethical awakening as well. Interest was alive on moral questions. It had shifted from politics to ethics. Philosophy had come down out of its theoretical basket amid the clouds of speculation and was walking on solid earth once more. It was undertaking to do for men what religion too frequently did not do—to give guidance in problems of conduct. There were moralists in plenty who were castigating vice and holding up models of virtue for imitation.

From *Pagan Regeneration*, Chicago, 1929, pp. 280-98. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The University of Chicago Press.

Almost every characteristic vice in Roman society was being met with the most vigorous protests and sometimes by active measures for amelioration. Slavery was a curse to that society, cultivating a cruel spirit of indifference to human suffering. But brutal masters were in a minority, and slaves had the right to acquire property and purchase their freedom. Legal enactment assured them of protection against cruelty, and an increasingly humane public opinion prevented grosser abuses. It is true that Roman amusements were debasing. The theater was obscene and the amphitheater with its gladiatorial combats was beastly; but Cicero testifies that many regarded the amphitheater as cruel and inhuman, while Plutarch, Seneca, and even Petronius joined in a chorus of personal condemnation of gladiatorial combats. It is true that marriage at this time was carelessly contracted and easily annulled; but inscriptions and literature both prove that marriages of love were at least as common as marriages of convenience—consider Pliny's graceful love letters to his Calpurnia and the *Laudatio Turiae*, which tells of forty-one years of happy married life. Moreover, there was an impressive and unanimous demand on the part of all moralists and philosophers that equal virtue should be required of men as of women. It is true that there was much infanticide in Roman society. Children were exposed and abortion was freely practiced. But Paulus, the jurist, branded these practices as assassination and "against the voice of nature and the voice of conscience." Moreover, one of the primary concerns of moralists was for the exemplary training of children. It is only too true, also, that the Romans knew of nameless sins. Yet the philosophers did not hesitate to denounce the epicenes who practiced them, and Dio Chrysostom was only the first to attack prostitution as a legalized vice. A balanced view of the whole social situation therefore shows high ideals and exceptional interest in moral problems.

There was at this time a particular demand for greater concreteness in ethical teaching. Abstract instruction was not popular, but the formulation of definite precepts was desired instead; hence the teachers of the time studied the writings of philosophers and moralists to find texts and maxims to use with their pupils. To some, ideals seemed more useful than particular precepts. So careful catalogues were made of virtues and vices, and the former were summarized in certain cardinal qualities especially to be desired. These ideals, however, proved generally too elusive, and there was a call for living examples which could be referred to as demonstrations of the practicability of ideals. This became the great teaching point of the age—the citation of examples. Each system had its own particular hero, Orpheus or Pythagoras; but Socrates, most of all, came to be regarded as a personification of the ideal for humanity. Seneca urged his friend Lucilius to keep before his mind constantly the picture of some upright man and to live always as if in his presence. The practical Roman regarded this as an excellent method in education and he had his sons taught by appeal to the examples of the past. Biographies were written with this didactic purpose in view. Notably was this the case with Varro and Plutarch in composing

their parallel lives of Greeks and Romans. The first century A.D. was an age of hero worship when concrete, living examples were called for.

Conditions of life were such at that time that most men did not have confidence in their own unaided ability to achieve character. They had "lost nerve," to paraphrase Gilbert Murray's expression, and they looked away to the supernatural realm for the powers that controlled personal conduct as well as the more ultimate destinies of mankind. What the men of the first century wanted was not so much ideals, but the power to realize those ideals; not a code of morals, but supernatural sanctions for morality. In the last analysis, it was the divine will, and not human welfare, that was the generally accepted criterion whereby the validity of any ethical system was tested. Accordingly, the religion which could furnish supernatural guaranties along with its ethical ideals had a preferred claim to first-century loyalty.

The stern morality of Judaism, like that of the Stoa, was not unattractive to many Gentiles; but the element that fascinated them was not the inherent excellence of Jewish rules for living but the fact that they had venerable sanctions bearing the impress of divine authority. The Law of the Jews was quoted as the *ipse dixit* of Yahweh himself and the scriptures were referred to as authentic documents providing the genuineness of the representation. Such confirmation was impressive to men who were seeking for divine authority to make moral conduct obligatory. The religion of the Egyptian Hermes, also, was one that offered supernatural guaranties for its ethical ideals. In the process of Hermetic rebirth, the powers of God drove out the hordes of vices and left the regenerate individual divinely empowered for right living. That was Mithraism's point of strength also and accounted not a little for the vogue it continued to enjoy for some time after the beginning of the Christian era. The "commandments" of Mithraism were believed to be divinely accredited; for had not the deity himself revealed them to the ancient Magi? One of the chief reasons why the high Mithraic ideals of purity, truth, and righteousness had real attraction was because Mithra himself was the unconquerable champion of these ideals and the ready helper of men who were willing to join with him in the eternal fight of right against wrong, good against evil. Mithraism was the outstanding example of a mystery religion which gave supernatural sanctions to the demands of plain morality.

The mysticism of the mysteries came in effectively at just this point to give both realistic content and divine authorization to the ethic of the brotherhood. The ideals of the group found personification and embodiment in the divine lord or lady who was the object of cult worship. Osiris was the model righteous man who functioned in divinized state as the judge of the departed. Hence the Isiac initiate, reborn as a new Osiris, was supposed himself to exhibit the Osirian type of righteousness. So, too, in the other mystery systems, the initiate realistically united with his lord and, actually transformed by virtue of that union, had his ideal incorporated within himself as a part of his very being. Thus, in the end, mystical experience became

the theoretic basis and practical incitement to good conduct. In this close articulation of mysticism and morality the cults made an important and distinctive contribution to the ethical life of the age.

It has been a general habit among Christian writers in both ancient and modern times to depreciate the ethical significance of the mystery religions and to emphasize instead the ceremonialism and theurgy which characterized their cult practices. This habit developed first of all from the apologetic tendency to exalt Christianity by damning its rivals as much as possible. A fairer view of the case reveals the fact that in the first century the well-developed mystery religions like nascent Christianity were vividly responsive to the awakened conscience of the period and were reinterpreting their rites accordingly. Moral as well as spiritual cleansing was attributed to ablutions and lustrations, and ethical as well as essential regeneration was sought in the bath of the *taurobolium*. According to Celsus—and Origen has no word to say in contradiction—the Eleusinian herald demanded of candidates for initiation not only clean hands and intelligible speech but also purity of conscience and a good life. This is an eloquent contemporary tribute to the moral influence of the mysteries. Yet it is only one instance out of many that might be cited.

When the mystery religions are viewed in their contemporary relationships, it is possible to distinguish in each instance the peculiar contribution of each to the moral development of the Mediterranean peoples. Orphism, true to its initial character as a reform movement, moralized the process of metempsychosis and placed exaggerated emphasis on the idea of retribution in the future. Mithraism, with its ideal of aggressive, militant virtue, had great appeal for practical-minded people in the Roman world. Isiac brotherhoods, with their restrained asceticism, registered characteristic protest against the immoral practices of the period. Each cult in its own way lent the sanctions of an ancient religious system to the demands of contemporary morality and in so doing made adjustment to the ethical requirements of the age.

The ultimate pledge that the mystery religions made to gentile religionists pertained not to the present but to the future. It was the assurance of a happy immortality. That was a matter about which there was general and very genuine interest in the first-century world. Whatever attitude a man might adopt on the question of continued existence after death, he could not well avoid the issue. The inevitable fact of death, together with the palpable injustices of first-century life, forced it upon his attention. As a symptom of the widespread interest in this problem the great variety of opinion which existed in educated circles may be cited. Some there were who succeeded in maintaining an absolute and consistent negative on the question. Others were just as positive in affirming immortality. Still others wavered between the two opinions.

There were many among the cultivated classes and more among the masses to whom the negative answer of Epicureanism was less than satisfying.

Those who were philosophically inclined turned backward for the confirmation of their faith to the classical arguments of "divine Plato" who had made the first great attempt at a rationalization of the belief in immortality. Cato of Utica, who by his death became an ideal figure for later Stoicism, spent the night before his suicide in reading the *Phaedo* of Plato. This same book was the last consolation of many another man who was the victim of proscription or of imperial tyranny. Cicero testified to the lasting influence of Plato in his day. There were many others also who like Cicero preferred to be wrong with the Greek idealist on the question of immortality rather than right with those who criticized him.

One sect in particular, the Neo-Pythagoreans, held Plato in special reverence and granted him a place next in honor to the founder of their order. These strange sectaries substantiated the belief in immortality by the authority of a revelation in definite scriptural form, bearing the names of Pythagoras and Plato. In detail their beliefs and practices were like those of their predecessors, the Pythagoreans of south Italy and the Orphics of Greece. They believed the soul to be divine and therefore immortal. By generation the soul was imprisoned in the body, and so long as it remained there it was in danger of corruption and of successive sojourns in this evil world. The whole aim of their practice was to secure the soul's liberation from the body and from the cycle of physical rebirths. By ritual purifications, moral discipline, and the practice of piety they believed this could be accomplished; so that, when the soul was freed at death it would ascend through the heavenly spheres to dwell with the blessed gods. To the Neo-Pythagoreans, death itself was a spiritual rebirth to immortality. In one of the most familiar documents of the Augustan religious revival, the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, the court poet of the Roman Empire gave lasting literary expression to the revived Pythagorean hope. This pagan apocalypse is a curious medley of Orphic-Pythagorean beliefs with an admixture of Platonic and Stoic ideas and various other elements more primitive; but it does give a vivid and picturesque impression of hopes and convictions that were cherished more or less extensively by Vergil's contemporaries.

A large body of first-century thinkers, however, were not satisfied with either the fantastic beliefs of the Neo-Pythagorean sect or the nihilism of Epicurus. Many of the most earnest souls of the time wavered in doubt, inclined toward belief, and found in the varying and ill-defined positions of Stoicism a harbor of refuge. At one point the Stoics agreed with the Epicureans. They had no fear of Hell. "There is no prison house, no lake of fire or river of forgetfulness, no judgment seat, no renewal of the rule of tyrants." On one other point they were generally agreed among themselves, that the ultimate destiny of the soul after death was reabsorption into the primal divine substance whence it had originally come. In Epictetus' memorable phrase, the soul was "a fragment of God." It was "fiery spirit" (*pneuma purōses*), and by virtue of its very origin and constitution it could have no other end than to return to its divine source. To quote a Stoic grave inscription: "The holy spirit which you bore has escaped from your body. The body remains here and is like the earth. The spirit is naught else

but God." Most Stoics were of the opinion that one day the universe would be reduced by general conflagration to its primal fiery state and a new cycle of existence would then begin. The question was, What would be the fate and condition of souls in the interim? Here most of the leaders disagreed. The older Stoics had little to say on the subject. Under the influence of Pythagoreanism and astral mysticism, however, the later Stoics became more definite. Posidonius, for example, was sure they would pass through a period of purification, and rising to heaven's height, would delight themselves by watching the stars go around. In general, then, the Stoics allowed for only a limited future existence before the soul merged once more into God.

Among the educated classes of the first century, therefore, one finds all shades of belief and unbelief, but almost universal interest in the question of the future. There were many who like Cicero, or Seneca, included within their own experience a changing series of beliefs. In the days of their happiness neither of these philosophers had much concern with the subject. But as years brought wider contacts and misfortunes of one sort or another, they both developed a more positive attitude. In 45 B.C. when Cicero was having his troubles in the public affairs, he suffered a cruel blow in the loss of his only daughter Tullia. The bitterness of this personal experience persuaded him that his daughter still lived among the gods, and he resolved to erect in her memory not a tomb but a shrine. Writing to his friend Atticus from gloomy Astura on the shore of the Pomptine marshes, he confessed this determination, half apologetically:

I wish to have a shrine built, and that wish cannot be rooted out of my heart. I am anxious to avoid any likeness to a tomb . . . in order to attain as nearly as possible to a deification. This I could do if I built it at the villa itself, but I dread changes of owners. Wherever I construct it on the land I think I could secure that posterity should respect its sanctity.

In the *Consolatio* addressed to himself at about the same time, he dwelt upon the divine and eternal nature of the soul in words suggesting Pythagorean inclinations. Cicero, then, was a type of the educated man who was not ashamed to stand in the crowd of those who "were stretching out their hands in longing toward the farther shore."

If there were doubts among the educated on the question of the future life, the masses generally were not perturbed by them. So far as we can gather, they had much more faith in immortality than their leaders were inclined to have. Plutarch maintained in so many words that the Epicurean negation of the future hope was repugnant to the majority. In contrast with the skeptical and materialistic epitaphs already cited, there are many touching inscriptions expressing confidence in immortality and reunion. One found on the grave of a married couple represents the wife as saying: "I am waiting for my husband." Generally speaking, the more traditional Greek and Roman ideas regarding the future seem to have persisted among the common people. Take, for illustration, a simple item of popular belief, the myth of Charon, that "grim ferryman of the muddy pool" to whom every dead man must pay an obol for passage money. Lucian said of this belief: "The mass is so preoccupied with the idea that, when a man dies,

his relatives hasten to put an obol in his mouth to pay the ferryman for his passage across the Styx, without first finding out what money is current in the underworld." Further arrangement was made for the future happiness of the dead by supplying them with the things they had needed or enjoyed most in this life. Hence, the belongings of the deceased were frequently cremated or buried with them, and sometimes definite provision was made for this in first-century wills. With an acceptance of the idea that the soul continued to exist after the death of the body, men longed for the assurance that this future existence was a happy, and not a miserable, one.

What religions were there in the first-century world to give men assurances in regard to the future of the individual? Not the new emperor worship, surely; that was concerned with a present salvation within the empire. Not Judaism, either, for Jews were still tenacious of their racial consciousness, and their future hope was predominantly national and Messianic.

The one group of first-century religions which did specialize in future guaranties were the mystery cults from Greece and the Orient. Originally intended to assure the miracle of reviving vegetation in the springtime, they were perfectly adapted to guarantee the miracle of the spirit's immortality after physical death. These were the cults which in the form of Dionysiac and Orphic brotherhoods had first brought the promise of a happy future life to Greece in the religious revival of the sixth century B.C. But Greeks at that time were too well satisfied with a life of present salvation to be much concerned with the future. The Orphic teachings regarding immortality, however, were taken up by the Pythagoreans and moralized by Pindar and rationalized by Plato. In Hellenistic times the Greek cults merged with similar religions from the east which offered equivalent guaranties, and in this syncretized form they came into their own. In the early imperial period they were more popular than ever, for they gave positive and definite answer to the questioning of the common man about the future. Their answer had the authority of revelation and it included the guaranty of divine aid in the realization of that blessed after-life which they vividly depicted to their devotees. Altogether the mysteries were unusually well equipped to meet the contemporary demand for assurances regarding the future.

When consideration is given to the fundamental character of the interests represented by the mystery religions, one can well understand their popularity in the Graeco-Roman world. In an era of individualism, when men were no longer looking to religion for guaranties of a racial or national order, the mystery cults offered the boon of personal transformation through participating in rites of initiation. At a time when men were seeking a larger life through contact with supernatural powers, the mysteries guaranteed absolute union with the divine beings who controlled the universe. In an age when men were craving emotional uplift, mystery initiation gave them such encouragement as they could scarcely find elsewhere. At a period when realism characterized thought in all departments of life, the religions of redemption offered men realistic rites to guarantee the actuality of spiritual processes. When supernatural sanctions were sought to validate

ethical ideals, the mystery cults provided a unique combination of mysticism and morality that was practically effective. When, as never before, people were questioning about the future fate of the individual soul, the mysteries, through initiation, gave guaranty of a happy immortality. At every one of these points the gentile religions of redemption were effectively meeting the needs of large numbers of people in Graeco-Roman society.

[MYSTERY RELIGIONS AND CHRISTIANITY]

Edwyn R. Bevan

RESEMBLANCES BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND PAGAN MYSTERY RELIGIONS

IT WAS INTO a world . . . permeated by mystery religions that Christianity was introduced. Attacks on Christianity in our time have largely taken the form of representing the Christian societies established amongst the Gentiles as nothing else but new mystery associations similar to the pagan ones already existing. It is unquestionable that the Christian churches present certain points of resemblance. Membership in both the churches and the pagan associations was by voluntary individual adherence, in contrast with the public religions in which men took part as members of a state into which they were born. And one may take note of that in connexion with a theory regarding the Church in England, which is current to-day in certain circles—the theory which makes the Church of England co-extensive with the nation—“simply the ‘nation’ (as the phrase is) in its spiritual aspect,” so that every member of the British state is *ipso facto* a member of the English Church. Such a view is worse than a corruption of Christianity: it is a denial of the very essence of the Church, of the character which it had from the beginning as a society in which membership represented a personal individual act of will; it is an assimilation of Christianity to the state religions of paganism.

Again, in the Christian churches, as in many of the mystery associations, men met in fellowship without respect to their race or social standing—Greek, barbarian, bond, free. Again, in both those mystery associations which worshipped Dionysos-Zagreus, Attis, Osiris, Adonis, or Persephone, and in the Christian Church worship was directed to a Divine Being who had undergone death and had risen again. In both, the virtue of the Divine Being’s resurrection was believed to be communicated to the members of the society, so that they too claimed to have acquired an immortal life, which could not be impaired by bodily death. In both, bodily washings were used which were believed to have an effect in the sphere of the soul. In both, the union of the society was expressed in communal meals, in the partaking together of food and drink, and in both certain acts of eating and drinking were held to have religious value. Nor would it be just to deny to many of those who joined some mystery-cult a genuine religious craving. Such cults may in their measure have “articulated and transmitted” to men “the touch, the light, the food of God.”

These resemblances are certainly striking, even if they are not worked up

From *The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (a symposium), Glasgow, 1929, pp. 104-15. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Blackie & Son.

to make the parallel more striking still. Of course if one writes an imaginary description of the Orphic mysteries, as Loisy, for instance, does, filling in the large gaps in the picture left by our data from the Christian eucharist, one produces something very impressive. On this plan, you first put in the Christian elements, and then are staggered to find them there. Possibly in some cases the resemblance between the inner life of a primitive Christian community and that of a pagan mystery association did become closer in practice than was compatible with the real character of Christianity. This is quite understandable when one considers that most of the members of the young Christian churches had once been pagans, and many of them had, no doubt, been in the old life members of some *synodos* worshipping Isis or Attis or Dionysos. We have seen, for example, that in many of the pagan mystery associations the liberal consumption of wine at the communal feasts had been a principal feature, and St. Paul evidently had a difficulty in making some of his converts at Corinth understand that the Christian communal meals were of quite another character (*I Cor.*, xi. 20).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND PAGAN MYSTERY RELIGIONS

Yet, when one has given full consideration to the points of resemblance between the pagan mystery cults and the worship of the early Christian churches, the differences remain equally striking. It must be remembered that the pagan mystery associations were not the only organized religious groups in the cities to which the Christian preachers came; there were also almost everywhere the local Jewish synagogues. And with the synagogues the Christian churches had at the outset much closer relation than with the pagan associations, the Church being indeed, one might almost say, an outgrowth of the Synagogue. If the great majority of the members of the Christian churches were of Gentile origin, numbers of them, it seems, had come to Christianity through an intermediate stage in which they had been attached, as proselytes or semi-proselytes, to the synagogues. And the antecedents of much in the Christian communal organization and worship are to be found in the synagogues, not in the pagan associations. The attempt made by Edwin Hatch in his Bampton Lectures (*The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*) to prove that the internal organization of the Christian churches, the arrangements for government and administration, were borrowed from pagan precedents is now generally regarded as having failed. To what an extent the forms of worship in the Church were taken over from the synagogue has been shown in Professor Oesterley's *Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*. Excommunication, again, as we find it described in St. Paul's epistles, has no analogy, so far as has yet been discovered, in the pagan societies, but has very close analogies in the Jewish synagogues.

A Christian church, in fact, was something quite new in the world, neither altogether like a synagogue nor altogether like a pagan association, in some features resembling one, in some features resembling the other, but in the essential principle of its life a new creation. We may note these points of unlikeness between the Church and pagan mystery associations.

Christian Worship Addressed to Some One Real.

1. The Divine Being whom the Christians worshipped as Lord was Some One who had been known as a real Man upon earth only a short while before, not a nebulous figure in an imaginary past. Christian devotion had a basis in solid historical fact. The actual words of Jesus gave his person, as the Church apprehended it, a distinct character of supreme moral power. That both in the case of the Christians, and in the case of those who worshipped Zagreus or Osiris or Attis, the Divine Being was believed to have died and returned to life, would be a depreciation of Christianity only if it could be shown that the Christian belief was derived from the pagan one. But that can be supposed only by cranks for whom historical evidence is nothing. The death at any rate of Jesus was an unquestionable fact admitted by everybody, and the belief that Jesus was risen again certainly began in the primitive community of his disciples almost immediately after his death—amongst a group, that is to say, of Aramaic-speaking Jews in Palestine, the people least likely to be influenced by Hellenistic mystery religions. Nor is it really anything strange that some pagans also should have worshipped a god who died and came to life again; for nature itself presented primitive man . . . with the spectacle of the periodic failure and revival of life in the physical world, and man everywhere, without any need of foreign suggestion, feels death as something dreadful; his desire for victory over it drives him to imaginations in which he sees it conquered. Just so, man imagined gods like Asklepios who cured human diseases; for he knew at first hand the ills of his own earthly existence, and if any real divine power came at any time to meet human need, the reality inevitably corresponded to a certain extent with what man had antecedently hoped and imagined. Jesus cured human diseases; it would be extravagant to suppose that the early disciples would never have pictured the Divine Compassion doing that, unless the idea had been put into their minds by the pagan cult of Asklepios.

The Descent of the Saviour.

2. The Lord Jesus had come down from heaven and had undergone death by a voluntary humiliation for love of men. That was of the very essence of the Christian conception. "Though he was rich yet for our sakes he became poor." No parallel to this has been found in pagan ideas of the Slain God. Osiris and Attis were not divine beings who had become men, but beings subject to death, slain against their will, who had become gods. The main content of the Christian idea, the belief to which Christian devotion responded, was lacking.

The World-wide Brotherhood.

3. Each local Christian church was vitally united with all others as part of the one Divine world-wide Church, the Body animated by the Spirit of Christ; there was one "brotherhood." On the other hand no close band seems to have connected an association worshipping Isis or Attis in one place with associations worshipping Isis or Attis elsewhere. Each little

group existed for itself, and made laws for itself. In this respect, again, the affinity of the Christian Church is not with the pagan religions but with the world-wide brotherhood of Israel, the "people of God" of which the Church claimed to be the true continuation.

Moral Earnestness.

4. From the Hebrew tradition the Christians drew a conception of God, by which righteousness, the morally good will, was all important in His service. There was no such moral earnestness in the service of Isis or Attis. It was there a question rather of new sensations, through which a man believed that he had become magically immune from death, than of a new direction of will, a character with a new set. In this the rebirth of the pagan votary differed essentially from what Christians understood by being born again, though in Isis-worship an ideal of chastity sometimes seems to have been held up. Mithras-worship indeed does seem to have contained an element of moral strength. But it has to be remembered that Mithras-worship had one of its main roots in the religion of Zoroaster—a religion strikingly different from Graeco-Roman paganism, with a strong original conception of truth and righteousness as the essential character of the One Supreme God, more like the religion of the Old Testament than anything else outside it.

The Christian Sacraments.

5. Of the two sacraments of the Christian Church, Baptism had its antecedents rather in the Synagogue than in the pagan mystery association. Of course the idea of bodily defilement disqualifying from approach to the deity is one which may occur anywhere, where man is man, and bodily washings and lustrations are found practised in religion all the world over. In the pagan mystery religions such lustrations had a place. But it is in Mithras-worship only that we get an indication of washing with water as part of the ritual by which a new member was admitted to one or other of the grades in the Mithraic system. Christian baptism, as a rite by which a new member is incorporated in the Body, a rite never repeated, is something quite different from the washings which in many religions come frequently into ritual worship. Christian baptism may quite well originally have been connected with the bath which had to be taken by a proselyte who was admitted to the community of Israel—an act by which he symbolically washed off the defilements of his heathen life, before beginning a new life as a member of the People of God.

How does the matter stand with the eucharist? "It is remarkable," wrote the late scholar, Albrecht Dieterich in his *Mithrasliturgie*, "that a sacramental meal should play so large a part in the dominant cults of later antiquity." This illustrates how people see what they are determined to see. Scholars of the school of Dieterich were determined to see in paganism close parallels to the Christian eucharist, and so they see sacred meals as the central thing everywhere in the mystery religions of the ancient world. But it is a case of "auto-suggestion." The odd thing rather is that we hear

so little about sacramental meals in connection with the ancient mystery cults. In regard to the Orphics they are never mentioned. One would have thought that Dieterich, having said that they played "so large a part," would find, when he went on to give instances, a large number of signal ones ready to hand. But what he gives comes to hardly anything at all. He mentions the formula of the Attis-cult, "I have eaten out of the timbrel, &c." But all we can gather from that is that amongst a number of ritual acts which a person being initiated had to do, one was to eat something out of a timbrel, and drink something out of a cymbal. There is nothing to give these actions of eating and drinking any significance above that of a number of other symbolical acts which had to be done at initiation. It is never suggested, for instance, that the community all together, as a regular act of worship after initiation, partook of food out of a timbrel. That would have been the parallel required.

The only other instance Dieterich can find is in an inscription from Tomi in the Black Sea, giving the rules of an association which worships the Kabeiroi of Samothrace. One fragment of it says that it will be the duty of the priest to divide and proffer the sacred cake and pour out "the drink (*τὸ ποτόν*)" for the associates. That is all. It goes almost without saying that the members of any association expressed their fellowship by meals taken together, as any set of men is apt to do all the world over. Certainly the ancient religious associations had such communal meals. And the meals would naturally be connected with the feasts in honour of the deity, or deities, of the association. That we may gather from a number of the inscriptions. But the meals appear rather as an expression of fellowship which the members have with one another and with the god than as the partaking of some food of particular significance. As has been pointed out, the convivial aspect is often prominent, and the plentiful supply of wine a concern. At such meals the priest would often be the natural president and be responsible for the due distribution of the food and the drink. But it is possible that at Tomi the association did partake in a meal, at which the cake and the drink, distributed by the priest, were something special. If so, we may grant that here something with a resemblance to the Christian eucharist may be found. But what a poor basis for the statement that a sacramental meal played "so large a part" in all the mystery religions! Amongst the hundreds of inscriptions relating to mystery cults, Dieterich can find only one from the Black Sea which seems even remotely to point to a sacramental meal!

In Mithras-worship alone amongst the ancient mystery religions we have the clear statement of something which looked like the Christian eucharist. Before the initiate there was set a piece of bread and a cup of water over which the priest uttered a ritual formula. Here, where the resemblance existed, the Christian Fathers took note of it. They said it was due to a deliberate imitation of the Christian eucharist by devils. It is likely that had the other apparent parallels, which scholars of the school of Dieterich and Reitzenstein try to-day to find, existed, contemporary Christian writers would have noticed them too and given the same explanation.

Christian Ritual and Doctrine not Secret.

6. The worship and the doctrines of the Church were not concealed by a veil of secrecy, but disclosed freely to the world. Here again the Church resembled the Synagogue, not the pagan mystery cults. No doubt, where Christianity was persecuted, the Christian meetings would be secret, but such secrecy was not an essential characteristic of Christianity: it was only a temporary expedient in order to escape violent attack. Apart from the peril of an enemy bringing trouble upon the Church, there was no objection to an unbeliever witnessing what took place at a Christian meeting and hearing what was said. As for the doctrines of Christianity, so far from being concealed from the world, the world was earnestly invited to listen to their proclamation.

Intolerance of Christianity.

7. Still resembling Judaism, Christianity was marked by an intolerance quite unlike the temper of the pagan mystery religions. No doubt when the Church became powerful in the world its intolerance took the form of imposing pains and penalties upon those who did not profess Christian beliefs; but that was the evil outgrowth of a kind of intolerance which really did belong to the essence of Christianity. The God of Jesus was still the God of Moses, the "jealous" God, who said "Thou shalt have none other gods but me." The different pagan cults were content to live all together as a happy family. Isis had no quarrel with Mithras. Indeed the same man is sometimes found receiving initiation in more than one mystery religion.

If the Christian Church had been content to form one in this happy family, to compromise with the pagan religions, with Emperor-worship and all the rest, it would probably have escaped persecution. It would also have perished, as all the rest have perished. But the Church steadily refused to compromise: it declared strongly that black was black and white was white, that Christianity was right and the other religions were wrong; and it refused to allow anyone who associated himself with any pagan worship to go on partaking of the Table of the Lord. So the Roman state bent its strength to break Christianity; and Christianity, with Judaism, the one other "intolerant" religion standing on the old Hebrew foundation, survived.

Christian View of the Time-process.

8. Lastly, Christianity, with its essential Hebrew core, remained predominantly eschatological. Whereas for pagan thought the world-process was an eternal vain recurrence, a circular movement leading nowhere, for Jews and for Christians it was movement from a unique beginning to a unique end, from Creation to the final Judgment and realization of the kingdom of God. For the pagan, the deliverance offered by a mystery-religion was a merely individual escape to a higher plane of being; for the Christian, salvation meant being incorporated in a society, which had a cause to fight for in the world and a confidence of ultimate victory. This

made a profound difference to the feeling of the Christian in regard to everything around him. The German philosopher, Heinrich Rickert, has laid his finger on this as the principal reason why Christianity prevailed in the end over pagan religion: for the Christian the time-process was a series of unique events, whereas for the Greek it was indefinitely repeatable. Such a view of the time-process had been Hebrew before it was Christian; but not Hebrew only; it was also Persian, Zoroastrian. The important thing to grasp when we look at that bewildering medley of religions in the first century A.D. is that they belong to the main types—the type for which the time-process was a vanity, to which Greek Stoicism and Hellenistic mystery-religions belonged, and the type with a strong eschatological outlook, represented by Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity.

COMPARATIVE DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE MYSTERY RELIGIONS

Probably two generations after the Lord's Resurrection Christianity had attained a diffusion in the Roman Empire wider than that of any mystery cult. The fact that monuments connected with the worship of the Phrygian Great Mother or of Isis or of Mithras are found in places far apart in Europe has probably given a false idea of the popularity of these cults in the West. The evidence, as it has been carefully analysed by Toutain, seems to prove that the only Oriental worship which had any popular extension in the Latin west was that of the Great Mother, and that her popularity was mainly due to a belief in her power to give fertility to the fields. In Greek lands the worship of Isis and Sarapis was perhaps widely popular, but in the Latin-speaking west it is found established only where there were groups of Greeks or Orientals settled, or where it was promoted by government officials, because Isis-worship was patronized by the Imperial court at Rome. Mithras-worship did not get its extension westward till the field had already been occupied by Christianity and seems then never to have penetrated far outside the army. It was soldiers, perhaps themselves natives of Asia, who put up the Mithraic monuments found in northern Britain near the Roman Wall. The Mithraic chapels which have been discovered do not give the idea of large communities of Mithras-worshippers. Since Mithras, according to the sacred story, had originally issued from the rocks his worship was carried on either in caves or in buildings simulating caves. His chapels have the form of crypts, sunk in whole or in part below the surface of the ground, and reached by steps from the entrance-hall. They are rarely large enough to contain more than a hundred worshippers. No doubt, where the Mithraic community was larger than that in any particular place, it may have been served by more than one such chapel. Still the fact that no large places of worship have been discovered suggests that the Mithraic communities were generally small ones. In view of all this to speak of Mithraism as a rival which ran Christianity hard and almost captured the Roman Empire—language which has often been used by scholars in the past—seems excessive.

RELATION OF PAUL TO THE MYSTERY-RELIGIONS

H. A. A. Kennedy

THE RELATION of the Mystery-Religions to Paul's environment requires no discussion. Ample evidence has been adduced to show that throughout the sphere of his missionary operations he would be in touch with many who had been initiated into Pagan Mysteries, and had finally entered the Christian Church. We cannot picture him engrossed in the cure of souls without recognising that he must have gained a deep insight into the earlier spiritual aspirations of his converts, and the manner in which they had sought to satisfy them. Even apart from eager inquiries, a missionary so zealous and daring would often find himself confronted by men and women who still clung to their mystic ritual and all the hopes it had kindled. It was inevitable, therefore, that he should become familiar, at least from the outside, with religious ideas current in these influential cults. Sometimes, as *e.g.* in the case of *γνώσις* and *δόξα*, these ideas found remarkably close parallels in the thought of the Old Testament. Thus he would be impressed by their capacity for holding a genuinely spiritual content, and would use them in circumstances in which their earlier history would tend to make them all the more effective. Certain important terms like *τέλειος*, *πνευματικός*, *σωτηρία*, and others, were in the air. They meant one thing, no doubt, for a Christian, and quite another for a Pagan. Yet their fundamental significance for both had elements of affinity, sufficient to link together the respective usages. The essentially religious meaning, for example, of *πνεῦμα* and *νοῦς* in documents of Hellenistic Mystery-Religion provided a common standing-ground for Paul and many of his readers. What holds of separate terms may occasionally be affirmed regarding groups of ideas. Thus the combination of *συμμορφιζόμενος* with *γιῶναι* in Philippians iii. 10 seems to indicate a background for the Apostle's conception akin to the Mystery-doctrine of transformation by the vision of God. But it has also become clear that we dare not make far-reaching inferences from terminology as to the assimilation by Paul of Mystery-ideas. For we were able to show that the central conceptions of the Mystery-Religions belong to a different atmosphere from that in which the Apostle habitually moves. There is no principle determining their relations, which in any sense corresponds to the Cross of Christ in the realm of Paul's thought and experience.

It is, moreover, vain to endeavour to find points of contact between Paul and the Mystery-cults on the side of ritual. Unquestionably he was too sensitive to the practical demands of the human soul to disparage the simple rites which he found existing in the nascent Church. Indeed, he was

From *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, London, 1913, pp. 280-99. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Hodder and Stoughton.

aware that the celebration of the Lord's Supper had its origin in the Master's farewell meal with His disciples. He was ready to recognise the high spiritual impulses which were quickened in the solemn surroundings of the Christian sacraments. He knew that these actions, with lowly, believing hearts responsive to them, became real channels for the Divine grace. But the essential characteristic of his religious attitude was detachment from ceremonial. It is no wonder that interpreters like Heitmüller and Weinell, who attribute a magical view of the sacraments to Paul, are concerned to point out that his sacramentalism is a sort of erratic boulder in his system as a whole. It would be foolish to demand for Paul a rigid logic in the concatenation of his thought. But his thinking is in no sense atomistic. And the vital centre of the organism lies in his conception of faith. Independent as are the gracious movements of a God, almighty and all-loving, they demand for their effectiveness the receptivity of the human soul. That is one aspect of faith for Paul. And the other is the personal appeal to God of the surrendered life. A heart to welcome, and a will to claim the supreme Divine gifts, and behind both, as their explanation, the emotion of a love created by the unspeakable love of Christ. Every living idea in Paul is irradiated by his faith, whether its form be juristic or theosophical or sacramental. To assign a position of any importance in the complex of his ideas to an element for which faith does not count, is to ignore the indissoluble connection between his thought and his religious experience. The centrality of faith, therefore, comes to be a criterion of every attempt at reconstructing Paul's spiritual platform. And here also we discover that there is no corresponding feature in the framework of the Mystery-Religions.

Nevertheless, we have every right to speak of the Mysticism of Paul. How is the term, in his case, to be interpreted? To many natures everything that savours of mystical experience is not only alien but offensive. They regard it as a purely pathological condition, the result of auto-suggestion. Or they view it as an unethical dissociation of personality from the salutary claims of normal life, with the aim of absorption in an impersonal Absolute. It is unquestionable that mystics have often laid stress on a more or less morbid self-mortification as the pathway to their goal, and that the *via negativa*, so dear to many of them, has resulted in a conception of God which really obliterates all that we mean by character. But it is equally certain that in numerous instances those who have yearned for and professed to attain real contact with the Divine have exercised a moral power yielding astonishing results in the sphere of practical life. Mysticism, in effect, is a term which covers a manifold area of experience. It is extremely difficult in the history of Christianity to distinguish it from those conditions of overpowering faith, involving profound emotion, which belong to the soul that has "counted all things as loss" for Christ. Indeed, Pfeleiderer can scarcely be said to exaggerate when he asserts that "the mystical element in Paulinism depends immediately and conclusively on Paul's notion of faith." Let us briefly analyse this mystical element.

The phenomena associated with Mysticism, and appearing in every age

and in all manner of environments, usually seem to presuppose a special type of temperament. . . . Yet it is plain that his "peculiar psycho-physical constitution" in no way detracted from the vigour of his ethical teaching. We have hints that the temperament of Paul was of a similar kind in the allusions he makes again and again to revelations (*ἀποκαλύψεις*) and visions (*ὄρρασεις*) which came to him, and especially in the remarkable description of an ecstatic experience given in 2 Corinthians xii. 1 ff. But no reader of the Epistles could ever form the impression that these occurrences, associated with special psycho-physical conditions, constitute for the Apostle a predominant feature of his religious life. We have ample evidence as to the attitude he assumes towards abnormal workings of the Divine Spirit. In his famous discussion of spiritual *χαρίσματα* in 1 Corinthians xii.-xiv., he makes no secret of his desire to curb all manifestations of intense spiritual emotion which are not calculated to edify the Christian community. And while he admits that such phenomena may spring from a real contact with Divine influence, he gives them no place in his impressive enumeration of the fruits of the Spirit. The distinguishing characteristic of these is their ethical quality. This is in full accord with one of Paul's most splendid achievements in the life of the Early Church, the transformation of the conception of the Spirit as a fitful energy, accompanied by extraordinary manifestations, into that of an abiding, inspiring power which controls conduct in the interest of love. His own ecstatic experiences must have been regulated by the same cautions. For this would certainly be possible. The testimony of the great Christian mystics warns us against confounding ecstasy with hysteria. They recognise, indeed, that there is often a justification for such comparison, and declare that ecstasies must be tested. The test consists "not in its outward sign, but in its inward grace, its after-value." This after-value is due to the high conviction that the soul has been carried into the world of Eternal Reality. All the evidence suggests that for Paul these experiences were not depressing but life-enhancing.

But in touching these more or less abnormal conditions, we are dealing only with the circumference of Paul's religious history. Its centre lies elsewhere. Weinel aptly remarks that the simultaneous origin of what he calls Paul's "Spirit- and Christ-mysticism" can only be explained from his experience on the Damascus road. This was for the Apostle a real contact with the risen Lord, the Lord as life-giving Spirit. There and then he came to be "in Christ" (2 Cor. v. 17). There and then Christ came to be "in him" (Gal. i. 16). . . . But while the ultimate fact which it endeavours to express eludes analysis, Paul himself supplies the material for estimating, up to a certain point, the process by which the ineffable relationship is realised. It is not established in any magical way. It is the Divine answer to faith. And the nature of the faith is not left obscure. In the most classical passage on union with Christ to be found in his Epistles, Paul illuminates the matter by a single flash. For he describes the faith which is the nexus in this fellowship as "faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. ii. 20). Here, obviously, the intellectual element in faith is not emphasised; not even that which is involved in Paul's attitude

towards the resurrection. This is a faith which has behind it the force of an all-subduing love. The emotion is the response to the redeeming love of the Cross, the most tremendous moral power with which Paul has ever come in contact.

Thus we can discern that the "Mysticism" of the Apostle has an inherently ethical quality. This might have been deduced from his conception of the Spirit, as we have briefly exhibited it. And that conception, of course, can never be dissociated from his experience of intimate communion with Christ, as appears from such crucial passages as Romans viii. 9, 10 ("Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness"). But we have preferred to keep to the main track of his thought, a track which leads through the hard realities of an earthly life. For Paul relates his supreme experience of fellowship, that which is far more precious to him than abnormal raptures (although he valued these), to the common existence which is his daily lot: "that which I now live in the flesh" (Gal. ii. 20). It is possible to go further in our analysis on the basis of the material presented in the Epistles. We have already emphasised the nature of the content of that supreme experience which lies at the heart of Paul's mysticism. He himself calls it, "being crucified with Christ." It occupies the central place in his exposition of the meaning of the Lord's Supper. There he describes it as "communion with the body and blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. x. 16). . . . The central implication of the idea is identification with the attitude towards sin of the crucified Redeemer and all that that involves, with its correlative of sharing in the victorious life of Christ as risen. Here is a type of mysticism which stands by itself. Its meaning, as we have seen, is fellowship with Christ. That fellowship involves the will. It could never be the product of mere feeling or brooding contemplation. It has little in common with the notion of absorption in the Deity which links together mystical aspirations in every age and every clime. If there is any possession which Paul holds dear, it is that of his individuality. His eager speculations on the "spiritual organism" are sufficient proof. Like Plato, he escapes what may be technically called "Mysticism" by "his unwavering belief in the indissoluble personality of the human *ego*." And as regards the Divine factor in the mystic fellowship, he has too keen a sense of the historical personality of the Lord to lose himself in the sea of absolute Being. These are never the categories with which he works. Indeed, to realise with vividness the limits which he imposes upon his mystical thought and feeling, we have only to reflect on his attitude towards deification.

We have pointed out the prevalence of this doctrine as the goal of mystical aspiration in Hellenistic religion. Dean Inge shows clearly that, in Eastern Christendom during the early centuries, owing to the fluid nature of the concept *θεός*, the notion of deification (*θεοποίησις*) was widely current in a somewhat vague sense, often scarcely distinguishable from immortality. But rash inferences were sure to be drawn, such as that of Methodius that

"every believer must, through participation in Christ, be born as a Christ." Developed on these lines the conception of personality was bound to become nebulous, as *e.g.*, in Eckhart's saying: "If I am to know God directly, I must become completely He, and He I: so that this He and this I become and are one I." Paul is careful to avoid language or thought of this type. When he approaches it, as, *e.g.*, in Galatians ii. 20, he expressly guards against possible misunderstanding. Perhaps the reverence born of his unwavering monotheism was a determining factor of his position. In any case, he never permits his aspirations to carry him further than the Divine *εἰκών* into which believers are being transformed (*e.g.*, 2 Cor. iii. 18). And it is easy to exaggerate the significance of the language he employs on that subject.

It is difficult . . . to grasp the precise nature of Paul's conception of the "transformation" (*μεταμορφοῦσθαι*). The only assertion which could be made with confidence was that we must guard against identifying it with the magical transmutation of essence central for the Mystery-Religions, as Paul's idea of the *πνεῦμα*, the chief factor in the transformation, is essentially moral. As a matter of fact, the highest relationship to God recognised by the Apostle is that of "children" (*τέκνα*) or "sons" (*υἱοί*) of God. "You did not receive the spirit of bondage again, resulting in fear: but you received the spirit of adoption (*υιοθεσίας*) whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. viii. 15, 16). Such a relationship is, as Lehmann has aptly described it, "personal, intimate; it breathes freedom; it is conscious discrimination, and therefore not mysticism," in the strict sense of the term.

A quite arbitrary emphasis has been laid by Schweitzer on the eschatological implicates of Paul's conception of union with Christ. He rightly contrasts that conception with the notion of the Mystery-Religions, that the living man, by means of gnosis and the vision of God, receives the Divine essence into his being. But he goes to the other extreme in holding that Paul attributes the experience of transformation to what he calls "a world-process." "As soon as the individual by means of faith and baptism enters into this new cosmic event (*Geschehen*), he is immediately renewed and receives Spirit, ecstasy, gnosis, and all that accompanies them." We get some light upon the meaning of this extraordinary state in connection with Paul's language as to "dying with Christ." Schweitzer criticises Reitzenstein for holding, as every unbiased exegete of Paulinism must hold, that the Apostle is here thinking of a deliberate identification of himself with the death of Christ, which involves the breaking off of relations with sin and the crucifying of the natural man. Instead, we are told that Paul is not concerned with an action performed by the believer. His conception rather is that "at the moment when the individual receives baptism, the process of the dying and rising again of Christ, without the believer's co-operation, without any exercise of will on his part, without any reflection of his, starts working in him like machinery which is set in motion by pressing a spring."

This grotesque misconception of Paul's religious standpoint is an ar-

resting instance of the results of "consistent eschatology," and warns us against approaching the Epistles with a ready-made framework into which their thought has to be forced. Let us admit without hesitation that Paul has his eyes fixed on the glorious consummation of the future. But let us no less carefully recognise that for that future he has no clear-cut scheme of things. Such utterances as Philippians i. 23: "having the desire to depart and to be with Christ," remind us that his eschatological forecasts were as flexible as our own. For here the idea of the Parousia falls completely into the background, and he regards death simply as a passing into the presence of the living Lord. It is only by ignoring many of the cardinal elements in his outlook that we can find the clue to his mysticism in those magical and mechanical processes which Schweitzer associates with the transference from the present to the coming Aeon. How far the Apostle is removed from the notion of a salvation which works automatically, appears from such statements as Philippians iii. 11: "if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead. Not that I have already obtained, or am already perfect: but I press on if so be that I may lay hold on that for which also I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus"; and 1 Corinthians ix. 27: "I beat my body black and blue, and bring it into bondage, lest by any means, after having preached to others, I myself should be rejected." It will take a bold interpreter to assert in the light of these and many similar passages that in Paul's view there was no co-operation of the believer, no exercise of will on his part in the matter of participating in the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection, but only an external, supernatural machinery, set a-going by the rite of baptism.

The central ideas of Pauline eschatology are essentially religious. Take, for instance, those which are most intimately linked to his experience of mystical union with Christ, namely, life and salvation. In Romans vi. 4-6 Paul deliberately interprets the "newness of life," which has been reached by communion with Christ, realised with peculiar impressiveness in the solemnity of baptism, as the norm for daily living (*ὡς . . . ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν*), and explains it as "no longer serving sin." Again, in Romans viii. 6, he describes "the mind of the flesh" (*i.e.*, the earthly nature as insensible to God) as death, while "the mind of the Spirit is life and peace." Beyond all question the terms "death" and "life" have direct eschatological bearings. But their content is in no sense exclusively eschatological. Paul invariably regards "life" as a present possession of the believer. But he would not have asserted that originally he possessed a natural life, while on surrendering himself to Christ he received a spiritual life. The new life is a renewal of the old from its very foundations. It embraces the physical (to use our distinctions) as well as the ethical and religious. Its only contrast lies in death. Death for the Apostle means the ruin of the whole personality. Life in Christ is something larger than existence and means the triumphant continuance of personality beyond the barriers of earth and time, in conformity with the nature of the glorified Lord, who is the image of the invisible God.

The same considerations apply to Paul's conception of salvation, which

is really "life" regarded from a special point of view. It is needless to cite passages which reveal the eschatological colour of *σωτηρία*. The fact that it occurs most frequently in the phrase *eis σωτηρίαν*, where it is a goal to be reached, is proof positive. But Paul has too keen an interest in the demands of daily life to defer the reality of salvation to a future crisis. Undoubtedly like eager Christians of every time he delights to think of that consummation in which the hampering conditions of material existence shall be surmounted. It is absurd to consider as a pessimistic aberration his passionate cry: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Has any yearning been more perpetually echoed throughout the ages? But no one was ever more conscious of the reality of salvation as an existing fact of experience. "God was pleased," he declares, "through the foolishness of the thing preached to save them that believe" (1 Cor. i. 21); "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1).

Our investigation has reached its limit. If it has accomplished anything, it has simply demonstrated afresh that in St. Paul we are confronted, not with one of those natures which is content to be the medium of the spiritual forces of its environment, but with a personality which has been shaped once for all in the throes of a tremendous crisis, and thenceforward transforms every influence to which it is sensitive with the freedom born of a triumphant faith.

CHARACTER OF JUDAISM

George F. Moore

OF ALL THE RELIGIONS which at the beginning of the Christian era flourished in the Roman and Parthian empires Judaism alone has survived, and it survived because it succeeded in achieving a unity of belief and observance among Jews in all their wide dispersion then and since. The danger of a widening gulf between Aramaic-speaking Jews and Greek-speaking Jews, which at the beginning of our era was not inconsiderable, was completely overcome. The influential party which we know by the name of Sadducees, who maintained that the Scripture alone was law, denying authority to the traditional law of their opponents, the Pharisees, shrunk after the war of 66-72 A.D. to a heretical sect whose distinguishing mark was the rejection of the doctrine of retribution after death. In the second century Pharisaism was completely triumphant both in establishing the authority of the traditional law and in making its eschatology Jewish orthodoxy. Down to the rise of the Karaites in the eighth century and their revolt against the Talmud there was nothing that deserves the name of schism, and that movement, after a period of vigorous and often violent controversy lasting some four centuries, gradually subsided into an innocuous sect.

The ground of this remarkable unity is to be found not so much in a general agreement in fundamental ideas as in community of observance throughout the whole Jewish world. Wherever a Jew went he found the same system of domestic observances in effect. This was of special importance in the sphere of what are now called the dietary laws, because it assured him against an unwitting violation of their manifold regulations. If he entered the synagogue he found everywhere substantially the same form of service with minor variations. The prayers (*Shema'* and *Tefillah*) might legitimately be said in any language, but in the public prayers Hebrew seems to have been generally used wherever Palestinian example was followed. In the same area the lessons were read in Hebrew accompanied by an Aramaic translation. The often cited Novel of Justinian shows that at that time there was a party among the Jews who contended that Hebrew was the only proper language for this purpose, while others, in accordance with the older usage of the Grecian synagogues, maintained that the lessons might also be read in a Greek translation. The decision of the emperor authorizes the use of Greek, commending the Septuagint but permitting the version of Aquila. "The Synagogue of Israel" (*Keneset Israel*)—we should say the Jewish church—might with good right have taken to itself the title catholic (universal) Judaism in an inclusive sense, not, like

From *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Vol. I, Cambridge, 1927, pp. 110-21. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Harvard University Press.

catholic Christianity, with the implied exclusion of a multitude of sects and heresies.

This unity and universality, as has been said, was not based upon orthodoxy in theology but upon uniformity of observance. But the same authorities which had regulated and systematized the worship and observance had also set forth the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion and its religious ethics and exemplified its characteristic piety, and these also were disseminated through the schools and the synagogues as an integral part of traditional belief and practice.

The character of this catholic Judaism can only be apprehended and appreciated through a detailed exhibition of its authentic teachings, but some of its distinctive features may be briefly summarized here.

The foundation of Judaism is the belief that religion is revealed. What man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man, he has made known in one form or another by revelation. Specific commandments had been given to Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Jacob; to Moses the complete revelation was given once for all. The prophets who came after him repeated, explained, emphasized, applied, what was revealed to Moses; they added nothing to it. The revelation to Moses was in part embodied in writing in the Pentateuch, in part transmitted orally from generation to generation in unbroken succession down to the schools of the Law in which tradition was defined, formulated, and systematized. The whole of religion was revealed—"nothing was kept back in heaven"—and the whole content of revelation was religion.

There could be but one religion properly deserving the name, for God is One; and revelation was not only consistent but identical throughout, for God is ever the same. The forefathers had fallen away from the true religion, not only by worshipping other gods and by worshipping their own God in a heathenish way, but by tolerating injustice and immorality. Later generations were far from living up to the acknowledged standard set for them in the twofold Law. But whatever the sins or shortcomings of the people, however negligent or however zealous in the practice of their religion, religion itself was neither impaired nor improved. It was perfect from the beginning, and therefore unalterable.

Modern students approach Judaism with prepossessions of so radically different an order that it requires an effort of imagination to put ourselves at this point of view. The idea of historical development in religion, as in science and in institutions—in civilization as a whole—so dominates us that it is hard to understand a religion to which it is a contradiction in terms. But it is idle to try to comprehend Judaism at all unless we are prepared to accept its own assumptions as principles of interpretation, and not substitute ours for them.

Nevertheless, theory to the contrary notwithstanding, Judaism had made great progress between the days of the last prophets and the end of the age of the Tannaim, and it had made it chiefly through the appropriation and assimilation of the prophetic teaching, including the prophetic element in the Law.

In this process a notable change took place. The mission and the message of the prophets was to the nation. The people in its solidarity was responsible for the evils, individual, social, political, which they denounced, and upon the guilty nation the judgment of God was about to fall. In its ruin the whole people would suffer the doom which collectively they had deserved. The only way of averting the catastrophe or repairing it was a religious and moral reformation in which the whole people should turn from their evil ways to God and the doing of his will, and to the allegiance and obedience of its origins. For this thoroughgoing reformation, our word, coming through the Latin version of the prophet Scriptures, is Repentance.

The provisions of the prophets were fulfilled in the extinction of the national state and the breaking up of the people. In the dissolution of the political community and the bond of a common cultus, and often in close contact and association with heathen, adherence to the religion of his fathers became for the individual not a matter of course but a matter of choice. Many, doubtless, fell away and were absorbed in the surrounding heathenism. The saving remnant was the true Israel.

Into this situation came an individualizing of the doctrine of sin, retribution, and repentance, such as we find in Ezekiel. That God bestows his favor on those who please him by conformity to his will and visits his displeasure on those who transgress or ignore it was in a general way an old and universal belief. Ezekiel converts it into an inexorable law of retribution, and as a counterpart he makes repentance the sole but all-sufficient ground for the remission of all former offences of the individual, as the earlier prophets from Hosea on had done for those of the nation. The law of retribution, especially when construed quantitatively as it is by Job's friends, conflicts with experience, and if such retribution in this life is insisted on as a necessary corollary to God's justice, can only lead to a denial of his justice, as the author of the book set himself to show by the example of Job. From this dilemma an escape was ultimately found in the transfer of the final sphere of retribution to an existence beyond death.

The individualizing of repentance was of vastly greater religious consequence. It not only became a cardinal doctrine of Judaism—its doctrine of salvation—but it impressed upon the religion itself its most distinctive character. The piety of the Psalmists is a testimony to the penetration of this idea. The interpreters of the Law taught that the promises of divine forgiveness attached to the prescribed sacrifices and expiations, including those of the Day of Atonement, contain the implicit condition of repentance, and when sacrifices and expiations ceased with the destruction of the temple, that repentance of itself sufficed. Religion thus became a personal relation of the individual man to God.

Long before the *sacra publica* in behalf of all Jews everywhere came to an end, the synagogue had become for the vast majority the real centre of the common religious life, and the cessation of sacrifice, however deeply it was deplored, caused no crisis. Religion had its seat in the home also, in the domestic rites, the table blessings, the private prayers, and

parental instruction of children. The personalizing of religion was furthered by the many observances obligatory on every individual, on the head of the family, the wife and mother, and gradually on the children as they grow up.

The synagogue was not in Jewish apprehension primarily a house of worship, but a place where the common prayers were said together and individuals offered their private petitions, and where the Scripture was read, interpreted, and expounded—a place of religious instruction and edification. It was a unique institution in the ancient world and it had a unique purpose, to educate a whole people in its religion. In this it was supplemented by the more advanced study of the *Bet ha-Midrash*, the Lecture-Room, and by what we may call professional schools for the study of the traditional law and the juristic exegesis of the written law.

The idea of God in Judaism is developed from the Scriptures. The influence of contemporary philosophy which is seen in some Hellenistic Jewish writings—the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *4 Maccabees*, and above all in *Philo*—is not recognizable in normative Judaism, nor is the influence of other religions, among which it is natural to think first of Zoroastrianism, to be discovered. The tendency of Zoroastrianism to exempt God from responsibility for the evil in the world by attributing the latter to another author conflicted so obviously with the fundamental idea of unity and with the explicit teaching of the Scriptures that it was rejected by Jewish religious thinking with all other forms of the heresy of “two powers.”

In the development of older conceptions both reflection and selection have a part, especially in regard to the moral character of God. Jewish monotheism was reached neither by postulating the unity of nature nor by speculation on the unity of Being—the physical or the metaphysical approach of science and philosophy—but by way of the unity of the moral order in the history of the world, identified with the will and purpose of God. In it, therefore, the personality of God was as integral as his unity.

Nothing in the universe could resist God's power or thwart his purpose. His knowledge embraced all that was or is or is to be. Though his abode was in the highest heaven, there was no place and no humblest thing on earth devoid of his presence. He was at once above all and in all. He was wholly righteous, and could not abide unrighteousness. But he was at the same time merciful, compassionate, and long-suffering. His two moral attributes were justice and mercy, but it was mercy that best expressed his nature. These ideas are derived from the Law and the Prophets. They were illustrated and confirmed by God's dealing with the patriarchs and by the history of the nation interpreted in the light of prophetic teaching.

The thought of God as father has its antecedents in the same sources, but has a much more prominent place in Judaism. While in *Philo* the phrase “father and maker,” adopted from *Plato*, is used in the sense of “author,” in Judaism, “Father in heaven” expresses a personal relation to the people collectively and to the individual. Taking it not as a theological proposition but as the attitude of piety, it is a summary of the whole relation between God and the religious man.

God's love to the forefathers is constant to their descendants also; they may be rebellious and sinful children, but they are his children still. What God demands of men is a responsive love, the love of the whole man, mind, soul, possessions, and effort. This is the sole worthy motive of obedience to God's revealed will, and it gives to right conduct the religious touch of emotion.

The corollary of the law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," is "Thou shalt love thy fellow as thyself," and, lest we should suppose this to be restricted to the fellow Israelite, the same chapter contains the additional injunction, "Thou shalt love the stranger (*ger*) as thyself." The rabbis defined this obligation, The property and the good name of another should be as precious to you as your own, and applied the principle to the laws of trade and to competition in business, and they made it prohibit injurious gossip as well as slanderous defamation.

Sin, in a revealed religion, is "any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God," equally whether the act or neglect itself is *malum per se*, or is morally indifferent. This conception, whether entertained by Jew or Puritan, is often called "legalism," and many bad things are said about it. The far-reaching religious consequences of the establishment of this relation between sin and law are commonly overlooked. For where sin is the violation or the neglect of a divine law, the only remedy is God's forgiveness. The primitive expiations and purifications are perpetuated in the Mosaic laws, but they no longer possess in themselves a mysterious, or if we choose, a magical, efficacy; they are rites which God has appointed for men to seek pardon through, and are thus conditions of forgiveness. Judaism, as we have seen, made repentance the condition *sine qua non* of them all, and eventually the substitute for them all.

Correspondingly, transgressions of what we call the moral law, for which the Mosaic law has no specific expiations—only the universal riddance by the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement—are not forgiven except upon condition of individual repentance. In other words, the legal conception of sin leads directly to the recognition that the only remedy for sin is God's forgiving grace, having its ground in his mercy, or his love, and its indispensable condition in repentance, a moral renovation of man which is compared to a new creation, with its fruit in works meet for repentance. To the Jewish definition of repentance belong the reparation of injuries done to a fellow man in his person, property, or good name, the confession of sin, prayer for forgiveness, and the genuine resolve and endeavor not to fall into the sin again.

The Jews in their wide dispersion looked forward to the day when they should be gathered again to their own land as the prophets had foretold, and an era of peace and prosperity should follow. The implicit or explicit condition of this restoration was a reformation (repentance) so complete that it amounted to a transformation of the whole character of the people. The magnitude of this change so impressed Jeremiah and Ezekiel that they could conceive it possible only as the work of God himself, who should not only cleanse them but put a new heart and a new spirit—his own

spirit—in them and “cause them to walk in his statutes and keep his judgments and do them.” Repentance itself is a gift of God, for which he is besought in prayer by the congregation and by the individual.

The prophets had depicted the golden age in various forms and frequently with idyllic imagery. The common element which was in the foreground of Jewish religious thought was freedom to live their own life and follow their own religion unhindered by foreign dominion, enjoying the favor of God. Some prophecies foretold a restoration of the monarchy under a prince of the line of David, and greater stress was perhaps laid on the legitimate succession out of antipathy to the Asmonaeen kings. The Scion of David, or the Son of David, or the Anointed (Messiah) son of David are titles of the expected king in the Tannaite literature and in the liturgy. The character of this ruler in the golden age to come is set forth in Isaiah 11, 1ff., which the official Targum closely follows.

In other prophecies, notably in Isaiah 40 ff., there is no mention of an earthly sovereign; God himself is the king of Israel. Borrowing the word from Josephus, we may call this the theocratic, in distinction from the political, type of the national hope. There is in the prophecies no indication of the human instrumentalities through which the will of the divine king is effectuated. In the thought of the makers of normative Judaism we may be sure that it was not a hierocracy, in which God was represented on earth by the priesthood. Rather it was the “learned,” the authoritative interpreters of the divine law, who would in that age not only teach the law but as judges apply it. The time when the Messiah should appear, or the rule of God be established in power, was fixed in God’s plan, and signs of its approach were given in the prophets, but it was God’s secret, into which it was not for men to pry.

The idea of God’s rule in his own people widened into the expectation of a day when his sovereignty should be established and acknowledged by all mankind, when “the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day shall the Lord be One and his name One” (Zech. 14, 9). The universality of the true religion is the origin and meaning of the phrase, *Malkut Shamaim*, “the reign of God,” or, in the familiar rendering of our version in the New Testament, “the kingdom of Heaven,” for the coming, or in their phrase, the revealing, of which prayer is made.

The utterances of the prophets about the fate of the heathen nations in this consummation were various. In the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel there are collections of vindictive oracles which consign them all and single to destruction, while others foretell only the overthrow of the great powers which successively oppressed Israel. The conversion of the remaining heathen appears in both the royal and the theocratic forms of the expectation.

One of the most salient differences between Judaism and the older religion of Israel is in the beliefs about what is beyond death. The ancient Israelites shared the primitive notions of survival, and imagined the dead, shadows of their living selves, as inhabiting the family tomb or gathered with the great multitude of the dead of all nations in a dismal cavern in

the inwards of the earth, the common lot of all. To the end of the Old Testament and beyond, this continued to be the general belief. Other peoples with whom the Jews were in contact had earlier separated the good from the bad dead—however they discriminated these categories—and their religions and philosophies developed the idea of divine retribution in the hereafter, frequently picturing the wicked there in torments apt to their offence. The prevailing representation was that the soul is by nature imperishable, and at death goes to the place and lot in another sphere of existence which the individual has deserved by his character and conduct in this life. Such conceptions were current in the Hellenistic world, and were appropriated by some of the Greek-speaking Jews, as we see in the Wisdom of Solomon.

In Judaea the belief in retribution after death took a different form. At the end of the present age of the world there was to be a universal judgment. The bodies of the dead would come out of the tomb and be reunited with their souls, that both together, the man entire, might be judged in the great assize. Those who were justified in the judgment would live forever on a transfigured earth, exempt from all the infirmities of flesh and the evils of the present world, while the wicked would be condemned to the unquenchable fire. This new eschatology was not unopposed. The Sadducees, as we have seen, rejected it for want of warrant in Scripture. The Pharisees were zealous for it, and insisted that it could be found in the Law. In the second century, if not earlier, they made a dogma of it by attaching an anathema to the proposition—whoever denies that the revivification of the dead is taught in the Torah has no part in the Future World. Eventually the doctrine triumphed completely.

The transfer of the sphere of final retribution to another existence not only put theodicy beyond the reach of refutation because beyond experience, but—what was of far greater religious consequence—reversed the whole interpretation of the experiences of this life. The afflictions of the upright are no longer punishments, but chastisements of love, evidence of God's favor, not of his displeasure. The prosperity of the wicked is God's way of letting irreclaimable sinners heap up for themselves greater condemnation. Nowhere is the effect of the individualizing of religion more conspicuous than in this eschatology. In the universal judgment every man is judged on the ground of his personal character and conduct.

The new eschatology did not displace the national hope. When the necessity of an adjustment was felt, it was accomplished by making the old golden age, the Days of the Messiah, which had once been final and perpetual, an intermediate and temporary period of determinate length, after which, with convulsions among the nations and cataclysms in nature, the last act in the history of "this world" was ushered in. There was no attempt to construct a doctrine of the Messianic Age or the Last Things. The apocalypses in their enthusiastic vagaries make up shifting combinations of native and alien elements. The sobriety and reticence of the authentic literature is a testimony to the good sense of the rabbis. Some of them had their own adventures in the occult, cosmological or theosophical,

but they did not profess to reveal the secrets of the hereafter, and they evidently had little taste for such revelations.

Judaism thus made religion in every sphere a personal relation between the individual man and God, and in bringing this to clear consciousness and drawing its consequences lies its most significant advance beyond the older religion of Israel. It was, however, a relation of the individual to God, not in isolation, but in the fellowship of the religious community and, ideally, of the whole Jewish people, the *Keneset Israel*. Not alone the synagogue but the entire communal life—even what we should call the secular life—knit it together by its peculiar beliefs, laws, and observances was the expression and the bond of this fellowship. Thus Judaism became in the full sense personal religion without ceasing to be national religion.

THE LAW. THE SCRIBES. THE SYNAGOGUE

Charles Guignebert

I. THE TORAH

THE KEystone of this whole edifice of priestly authority was the *Torah*. In its name the High Priest, the priesthood, and the Temple itself as an institution, claimed and exacted the obedience of Israel. The word *Torah* means "doctrine" or "teaching," in particular, "religious teaching." It is generally rendered by *the Law*, following the Septuagint, and also Josephus and Paul, who use ὁ νόμος; but this is not an exact equivalent. The term *Law*, with its suggestion of formalism, rigidity and dryness, fails to represent the infinite variety of meaning in the word *Torah*. The sovereignty of the *Torah* is one of the essential factors of Late Judaism and demands special attention. The Law had always been the central interest of the Jews, but it had never attained, before the exile, the absolute and despotic sway which it exercised over post-exilic Judaism. This was due in part to the determination of the priesthood of the Return, but above all to the disappearance of that natural check to formalism, the phenomenon of *Prophecy*.

At the beginning of the *Restoration* prophecy as an institution was already at the point of death, though it produced Haggai and Zechariah. It seems strange to find Nehemiah, who played an important part in the reorganization of Israel after the Return, placing the prophets in the enemy camp. "*Remember*," he says, "*O my God, Tobiah and Sanballat according to their misdeeds, and also the prophetess Noadiah, and the rest of the prophets, that would have put me in fear.*" This hostility is natural, for the Law (of which Nehemiah is the exponent) must, in its strict and narrow form, always hate and fear the prophet, the mystic, that independent and often unorthodox element in religion. For the inspiration of the prophet is emotional in character, and emotion has small patience with the shackles of immutable law. After the Return prophecy merges into apocalyptic, and with the book of Daniel the former begins to be superseded by the latter.

This form of prophetism may strengthen and uplift religious emotion, but it does not encourage the spontaneous outpourings of natural piety. On the other hand there is no difficulty whatever in reconciling it with legalism. The future belonged to the *Doctor of the Law*, the man whose function it was, to expand and adapt, to add interpretations, explanations, commentaries and glosses to the traditional ordinances of Jahweh.

Till then the *Torah* had been alive. That is to say, it had undergone what-

From *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*, New York, 1939, pp. 62-81. Used by permission of the publishers, E. P. Dutton & Co.

ever alteration, revision and expansion was necessary to keep it more or less in harmony with the various requirements of successive generations. But the Law codified and published by Ezra and Nehemiah was the work of the Scribes and priests of the Captivity. It had no relation to life, no possibility of immediate application, and reflects an ideal of static perfection, the familiar clerical desire for some settled and final scheme of organization. Its motive was to establish a theocracy, and at the same time to authenticate and justify it. Priestly authority is by nature conservative; one could scarcely imagine it otherwise. And, although the exegesis of the Scribe might mould or stretch the meaning of the text to cover cases that the lawgivers had not foreseen, it had to start with the assumption that the text itself was fixed and inviolable. The law was believed to contain the absolute and unquestionable will of God, and its prohibitions were in a sense a test of the unquestioning obedience due to the Lord of all, a test making the same demands on the pious Jew as the *tabu* upon the Tree of Knowledge made on Adam in Eden. Hence the *Torah* itself became the object of an actual cult. It was personified as the well-beloved daughter of God, begotten before the world began; Jahweh was said to devote his leisure hours to its study, to observe it himself and to read aloud from it on the Sabbath. Needless to say, there was no mention of the alterations and embellishments which it had often received from the hands of man. Moreover, the paradox was ignored by which the God of justice and of mercy, whom the prophets had proclaimed as universal and absolute, was invested with the moods and caprices of some local deity, granting Israel a unique and certain means of gaining his favour through the study and practice of a complete code of rites and observances better suited to the worship of the Baals of Canaan, and in fact mainly derived from this source. The universal opinion in Palestine was that of Ben-Sira: "*All these things are the book of the covenant of the most high God, even the law which Moses commanded for an heritage unto the congregations of Jacob.*"

Henceforth the *Torah* could only be regarded as the unalterable Rule and absolute standard of all religious life; the sole and immediate source of God's truth. And it followed that the constant reading and pondering of the Scriptures came to be looked upon as the religious exercise *par excellence*, far more necessary even to the layman than participation in the cult, which, owing to his lack of special knowledge, could only be a passive one. The piety of Israel was measured in terms of its extreme veneration for the Law even more than by the exactness of its observance, for in practice certain concessions had to be made, otherwise the life of the community would not have been tolerable, but these concessions rather added to than detracted from the respect in which the letter of the law was held. And any member of a Jewish community who failed in the necessary reverence might be dealt with very severely.

As a matter of fact, the *Torah* does not promulgate dogmas or metaphysical ideas, or even, properly speaking, any system of ethics. It makes definite and final statements about the will of God and his omnipotence, and lays down certain *practical* rules, either *negative* (prohibition) or

positive (commands). The strict observance of these rules is an absolute necessity for the good Jew, because only by this means can he retain that legal purity upon which a right relationship with Jahweh depends. The effort to preserve this purity easily becomes an obsession. It gives birth to innumerable minor rules of ever-increasing particularity, which seek to anticipate and provide for every conceivable short-coming.

The natural deduction would be that all this dry legalism, this hypertrophied scrupulosity, which Renan rightly calls the "*rust of religion*," ended by utterly extinguishing the flame of true religion in Israel, but this was not the case. The spirit of legalism was counterbalanced by a new and very different impulse which was manifested in the Psalms. They are imbued with a spirit of warm and spontaneous personal piety, that seems like a direct heritage from the religion of the Prophets. Probably the explanation is that the immediate result of the Return was a strong wave of spiritual life out of which the Psalter sprang.

It is clear that the written Law, ascribed to Moses, was accorded supreme and absolute authority; but this was only theoretical. In practice this authority appertained to the interpretation "*according to the tradition*." In itself the *Torah* was simply the dead letter. What gave it vitality was the work of the Scribes who adapted it to the needs of the moment and brought it into contact with the daily life of men. I have already pointed out that the redactors of the *Targums* had no hesitation in altering any passages which might offend the susceptibilities of their contemporaries, and this tendency was general in Israel about the time of the birth of Jesus. Passages of the Scriptures which seemed out of date were either ignored or else so transformed that they acquired a new meaning. Even the *Midrash* completely misrepresents a number of the old ideas which it undertakes to clarify and explain. But after all the tractate *Sopherim* tells us that God taught Moses forty-nine different ways of interpreting the Law, which leaves the commentators quite a comfortable margin.

The *Torah* alone could not have nourished and sustained the vitality of the religious life of Israel; what provided the necessary flexibility and variety was the *tradition*. Custom (*minhag*) had always played a large part in the everyday life of the Jews, and Ezra reckoned with this when he drew into the orbit of the *Torah* a number of ancient practices which were quickly added to the code sponsored by Jahweh. The first function of the commentators was to elicit from the Scriptures such religious precepts as seemed suitable to the age in which they lived, and to study God and man and their mutual relations so that the best possible balance might be struck between the will of the Creator and the interests of his creatures. It was the fulfilment of this task, at once doctrinal and ethical, which gave rise to the *Haggadah*. In the second place, the commentators strove to subject the precepts of the *Torah* to a searching *legal* analysis, with a view to defining them more rigidly, and also to enlarging the scope of their application. They sought to follow them out to their logical conclusions and to seize and express the true meaning of the *unwritten Law*, which was

soon held to be just as much the acknowledged word of Jahweh as the Scriptures themselves. This accretion, mainly legislative, constitutes the *Halachah*. It was this twofold stream of exegesis which nourished the religious life of Pharisaism, without which Judaism would certainly have foundered.

II. THE SCRIBES, DOCTORS OF THE LAW

The heading of this section refers to the men who carried out this vast work of adaptation, namely, the *sopherim*, or *Scribes*, whose appearance [was] . . . one of the outstanding phenomena of the Restoration period and . . . an essential factor in the building up of legalism. Among the other names by which the Scribes were sometimes known are *hakhamim* ("wise men") and *Rabbis* ("masters"). They had also the courtesy titles of *abba*, meaning "father," and *more* ("guide," Greek *καθηγητής*).

Most scholars consider the Scribes (with the Synagogue which really developed from them) as the most distinctive creation of the post-exilic period. Their influence dates from the time when Jahwism began to be identified with the application of the Law, and to become more and more the religion of the Book, since *nomocracy* seems to be the natural and inevitable complement of *hierocracy*. But we have reason to believe that the earliest Scribes arose during the Exile, when the Jews turned their attention to the relation between the observance of the *Torah* and the state of Israel at that time. It was not in Palestine that Ezra matured, yet in the book that bears his name (Ezra vii. 11) we find him characterized as "*the priest, the scribe, even the scribe of the words of the Lord, and of his statutes.*" Nehemiah (viii. 1) refers to him in similar terms and depicts him expounding the law to the people.

As Jewish life was reorganized along the lines laid down in the Law of Ezra, the Scribes gradually gained in importance and their special type of learning took definite shape. Probably the pioneers of the movement, the men who first undertook to study the *Torah* from a purely human and practical point of view and to make it legally applicable to doubtful cases, belonged to the priestly class. But as the priests yielded to political influences and allied themselves ever more closely with the aristocratic followers of the long line of foreign rulers (Persians, Greeks and finally Romans), the Scribes became more definitely experts and specialists and became distinct from the priestly class.

The next step was for each Scribe to found a school (*Beth-ha-Midrash*) of which he was the *Rabbi*, and in which his teaching was followed more or less closely according to the amount of prestige he enjoyed. His disciples surrounded him with an atmosphere of reverent devotion. In theory he was unpaid and had to practise some other profession for a livelihood.

The passion with which these doctors guarded and protected the *Torah* united them into a political party when its authority was threatened. Thus, when Antiochus Epiphanes made his attempt to Hellenize Israel, it was the Scribes who incited the *hasidim* to their stubborn opposition. The stand made by these *hasidim* should not be confused with the Maccabean revolt,

which was a much more *popular* movement. It seems that the Scribes and *hasidim* only rallied somewhat grudgingly to the standard of Judas Macabaeus, and that as soon as the principle of national independence was established, they reassumed their old complete autonomy in their schools.

Their strength lay in the fact that they did not devote themselves solely to a theoretical study of the *Torah*, but were also occupied in elucidating and defining its practical application. They were not only jurists and canonists, but also moralists and casuists. The tractate of the *Mishnah* called *Pirké Aboth* ("the Sayings of the Fathers") quotes the threefold injunction which is supposed to have emanated from the celebrated *Great Synagogue* of 444: "*Be prudent in judgment; make many disciples; put a fence about the Torah,*" and in the midst of the disasters of Israel the Scribes set themselves to follow this advice. Even the capture and destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 did not hinder them, for the tradition of the Exile yielded explanations for all the trials of their people, explanations which made their sufferings easier to bear and even held out hopes of reward. They regarded these misfortunes as the chastisement which they had deserved at the hand of Jahweh, and believed that Israel would soon receive the due recompense of his justice and his fidelity to his Promise. After the destruction of the Holy City by Titus, the Scribes dispersed to various centres in Jamnia, Tiberias, Lydda and Babylon, and it was in the schools which they founded in these places that the compilation of the *Talmud* began.

About the time of Jesus the *sopherim* were distracted by various different scholastic tendencies. There is no reason to believe that there was any actual clash of doctrines, but the schools varied somewhat in their spirit, and the divergence is noticeable in the details of their interpretations of the Law. They were well aware of these differences, and although we cannot clearly envisage or even understand the disputes to which these differences gave rise, there is no doubt as to their intensity. This characteristic of the intellectual life of these academic centres is important if we are to understand the religious ideas they promulgated. The reader should bear in mind that they really were *schools*, and not *sects*.

Their differences centred round two famous leaders, Hillel and Shammai. The first represented a more liberal tendency, a somewhat less stringent observance; the second was in favour of a rigorous orthodoxy. But the evidence we have hardly seems to justify an opposition which appears to have been both strenuous and prolonged. Any general statement of the position must necessarily be inadequate and over-simplified, but we might perhaps say that Hillel, in his exposition of the obligations imposed by the *Torah*, emphasized neighbourly love and a spirit of conciliation, while Shammai, in similar cases, insisted on strict observance and of the absolute authority not only of the commands of the *Torah* but of the jurisprudence of the Scribes. The story runs that a Gentile with inclinations to become a proselyte came to Hillel one day and asked him what was the essential commandment of the *Torah*, and Hillel replied: "*Do not unto others as you would not that they should do unto you.*" This saying, so thoroughly in the spirit of the Gospel, which occurs in Matthew vii. 12 and Luke vi.

31, in the form of the *Golden Rule*, has given rise to the theory that Hillel was the real teacher of Jesus. Hillel allowed divorce (that is the putting away of the woman) only when she was guilty of adultery, whereas according to Shammai she might be divorced for spoiling her husband's dinner.

It is difficult for us to realize the immense reputation and undisputed authority attained by some of the Scribes. The common people looked up to them with reverence, and women of all ranks showed them special favour, which Josephus attributes to their supposed intimacy with Jahweh. In spite of this respect, however, the people were not always docile. For example, although the general feeling among the Scribes was against the impulsive acts of violence that accompanied a revolt, it was by no means always possible to prevent them.

The New Testament always classes the Scribes with the *Pharisees*, who also represented in Israel the legalistic and exclusivist party, but who constituted neither a sect nor a school. They are named together as though complementary to one another: e.g. "*Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites*," in Matthew xxiii. 13. The redactor has not confused them, but connects them, as is frequently the case in the literature of Late Judaism. Moreover, it is perfectly natural that the Pharisees, whose aim was to live according to the Law, should have been regarded as the allies—or even the followers and disciples—of the Scribes, who were the interpreters of that Law. Certain passages of the New Testament clearly express this close agreement. For instance, Mark (ii. 16) has "*The Scribes of the Pharisees*" (οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν φαρισαίων), and in Luke v. 30 we find "*The Pharisees and their Scribes*" (οἱ φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν).

Nevertheless the Scribes must not be identified with the Pharisees, nor must the Pharisees be regarded as a party led by the Scribes; for there were Scribes who were not Pharisees at all. It is none the less true that the Pharisees found in the Scribes—those leaders and inspirers of Judaism on its legalistic side which they also represented—a solid support and justification. As for the Scribes, they may appear to be mere casuists and hair-splitters, but this is really a superficial view, which only considers the letter of their religion and not the feeling underneath. These subtle dialecticians, obstinate and vain, full of absurd pedantry about trivial details of ritual and observance, were nevertheless at heart deeply pious, exponents of a religion characterized by a broad humanity. It is difficult to form a convincing picture of their attitude with its contrasting elements, for the modern world has nothing like it. But we should do well to bear in mind that far from being crushed or oppressed by the minuteness and complexity of their practical exegesis of the *Torah*, they were exalted and delighted by it. The *Torah*, which they made so burdensome, was no burden for them. On the contrary they rejoiced in it, finding in its every word the visible sign of Jahweh's love for his people. To the pious Jew, living in constant contact with the Law, which was in a sense his very life, the fulfilment of any one of these prescriptions, which seem to us so wearisome, was an act

of infinite gratitude to God, who had deigned to vouchsafe this Law to Israel.

III. THE SYNAGOGUE

The link between the Scribes and the people was the *synagogue*. It is an expression of religious life whose origins go back to a practical need and not to a question of principle. Neither its beginnings nor its workings in this early period of its history are very easy to trace. The *word* is Greek (*συναγωγή*) and means "assembly." It has several equivalents in the language of Hellenized Judaism, which mean the "assembly," or the community, as well as the synagogue. Josephus, for instance, sometimes uses *sabbateion* (*σαββατεῖον*), which describes the synagogue by its chief function, that is to say, as a place where men congregated on the Sabbath. The Palestinian word is *keneseth*, including both the place and the gathering held there.

The uncertainty as to the origin of the synagogue has given rise to several rather divergent theories. According to the Jews of Jesus' day the founder was of course Moses himself. Friedländer, on the other hand, goes so far as to maintain that it was the creation of Hellenized Judaism, and was introduced into Palestine by the Essenes, who were themselves under Greek influences. But this thesis has not found much favour, especially in view of the passage from Psalm lxxiv., (v. 8), which runs, "*They have burned up all the synagogues of God in the land,*" which can hardly mean anything but the synagogues. Friedländer's contention that the earliest non-Essene Judaean synagogues (those of the Libertines, the Cyrenaeans and the Alexandrians) belonged to the Jews of the Dispersion really proves very little, since the authors of the Acts, which is the source of our information, would not have been concerned with any others. It would be difficult to prove the absence of *others*, that is to say, synagogues of purely Palestinian origin, in Jerusalem about the time of Jesus' death. Wellhausen supports the more logical hypothesis that the synagogue dates from the Exile and arose in Babylon out of the necessity of providing some local centre as a substitute for the Temple in maintaining the continuity of worship among the exiles. A similar necessity gave the synagogues of the *Diaspora* their extreme importance.

For my own part, I am prepared to believe that the first steps were taken during the Exile, by pious men (*hasidim*) who wished to find a common expression for their unswerving devotion to Jahweh, but I am inclined to think that it was in Palestine during the Persian period that the institution really took definite form. In that case its rise would have been a result of the stress laid by Ezra and Nehemiah on the knowledge of the *Torah*. The dissemination of this knowledge demanded a new centre of religious instruction for the people, since the Temple, which was, moreover, unavailable to more than a small section of the community, was not concerned with teaching.

In principle, there was certainly nothing in this innovation hostile to the Temple; the synagogue was rather its complement, and wherever priests

were found, they played an important part in its organization. Later, when the synagogues had become the special domain of the Scribes, they were perhaps not always well disposed to the priestly dignitaries of the Temple; but this attitude should not be regarded as more than a question of tendencies and personal feeling.

The synagogue was not a temple, for Gentiles were not excluded from its meetings, though it was true that they might advance no further than the threshold. It was a *meeting-place for the pious*. But it differed from one of our own churches, which, although a consecrated place, is open to unrestricted public use. A synagogue presupposed the existence of an organized community; it was the place where men and women became aware of themselves as a community and sought edification. From another angle we may look upon it as the organ of legalistic supervision and control, a centre of religious instruction; for it was in theory the seat of a spiritual government which ordered and disciplined the lives of the people.

As it was not a temple, the synagogue had no *minister*. A priest might occupy an important position in it, but it would be as a *teacher*, not in his official capacity. The recognized leader was the *Rabbi*, or doctor of the Law. But the privilege of teaching in the synagogue was not confined to him. On the contrary, any Jew who felt ready and able to do so, whether he were a member of the community or simply a passing stranger, might ask and obtain permission to expound the Scriptures. The synagogue was thus a thoroughly democratic institution. It might almost be described as a sort of *popular religious university*.

Here the worship was confined solely to the reading of the *Torah* and the *Nebiim*. The scriptural passage read formed the basis of a commentary and the text of an address in which ingenuity and learning of the speaker had free scope. Naturally any professional *master*, or *Rabbi*, who happened to be present would make the most of such an opportunity. The singing of Psalms and congregational prayers completed the religious activities of the meeting, but, strictly speaking, there were no sacrifices and no liturgy, and this is what gives the synagogue its unique place among the religious members worshiped wholly *in spirit and in truth* and whose rites were no more than organized individual impulses, only restricted by the need to ensure the order and edification of the meeting.

Unfortunately little is known of the organization or development of synagogues in Palestine. There is more evidence concerning the synagogues of the Dispersion but it would be unwise to apply this to Palestine, for it is quite possible that the practice of these two great sections of the Jewish world did not exactly correspond. There may well have been variations from district to district, even from town to town, and indeed it is difficult to see what central authority could possibly have laid down or enforced strict rules for the direction and organization of a synagogue. Quite a small number of Jews—probably a minimum of ten—could constitute the initial group. This little community, of which its synagogue was both the centre and the symbol, was usually led by a *council of elders*, either co-opted or elected. This was an administrative council under the direction of either

one, or three officials (in Greek, *archisynagogoî*), who maintained order and regulated the finances of the synagogue, collecting subscriptions, authorizing expenditure, and agreeing on the best use to be made of such offerings as were received. An official called a *hazzan* (*ὑπηρέτης*), who was a kind of beadle and schoolmaster, kept order at the meetings (sometimes a very necessary duty), and was responsible for the correct reading of the Scriptures. It was also his duty to teach the children to read and write so that they might be able to gain a proper knowledge of the *Torah*.

There was a meeting in the synagogue every evening, but the whole community was under no obligation to assemble there except on the Sabbath or for the special religious festivals. In this way the religious rhythm of the synagogue coincided more or less with that of the Temple. As a centre and focus of community life it was full of vitality and vigour. The members all knew one another and were quick to notice lapses and equally ready to encourage and applaud manifestations of piety, that being the sole standard by which anyone in the group was ever judged. The synagogue was used not only for reading, listening, singing and praying, but also for discussion, an exercise for which the Jews soon showed a peculiar talent. They took to this intellectual warfare so readily and derived such pleasure from it that arguments would be started on every possible occasion, and they became more and more passionately addicted to subtle and ingenious interpretations. The Scribes who had done so much to develop this very spirit naturally welcomed its appearance in the synagogue, and if their teaching, which was the fruit of their own schools, remained rigid, they themselves revelled in this propitious atmosphere.

As a rule the founding of a synagogue cannot have been a matter of great expense, hence they probably sprang up throughout the country. Doubtless every village had one and a town more than one, in some cases a considerable number. The total for Jerusalem at the time of its destruction (A.D. 70) has been put as high as 480, which must have meant that the community served by each was very small. There is nothing strange about this co-existence of the synagogue and the Temple if we remember the special function of the former, that of disseminating among the people the particular kind of religious instruction necessary for their understanding and proper observance of the requirements of the Law. It formed the popular platform of the *sopherim*.

No doubt the synagogues vied with each other, just as the school did, in the subtlety of their interpretation of the *Torah*, and like those academic institutions, any synagogue possessing the services of a Rabbi specially skilled in this work would carry the subtlety of its exegesis of the Scriptures to the point of absurdity. In fact—and this is the heart of the matter—the synagogue came to be more and more the focus of Jewish religious life. It provided the men of that day with all they found most congenial, so that even with the destruction of the Temple, in A.D. 70, the religion of Israel sustained no essential or devastating loss. For if it was returned exiles who had set up the *Torah* as at once the centre, the motive and the object of religious life, it was the synagogue, aided by the School, which had

been the real Temple of this new cult. This practical replacing of the house of Jahweh on the mountain of Zion by the synagogue had happened gradually, and as it were unconsciously, but it effected serious changes in the organization of the Jewish religion none the less. The reader should not forget the extremely important part played by the synagogue in fixing the canon of the Bible, accepting or rejecting various works, and making the final decision by which certain books were stamped and consecrated as *Scriptures*.

Further, neither the synagogue nor the School could confine itself entirely to the niceties of the theoretical interpretation of the *Torah*. The Jews are an intensely practical race and they demanded an equally detailed study of its *application*, an exhaustive system of legalistic prescriptions based on a minute survey and analysis of every problem and action of the ordinary Israelite in the course of his daily life. Thus it was through the medium of the synagogue that the whole existence of the Jews became enmeshed in the web of pious obligations that is generally regarded as the distinguishing mark of Late Judaism. This often exaggerated and even childish insistence on formalism is no really inherent part of authentic Jahwism. On the contrary, it is quite alien to the spirit of the ancient religion of Israel.

IV. ISRAEL, THE PEOPLE OF THE TORAH

There is no denying that this constant effort to live according to the spirit and the letter of the *Torah*, and not to transgress the narrow boundaries it imposed, did tend to imprison the pietists in a somewhat rigid formalism. Their material and moral expansion was hampered by a network of narrow and exacting prescriptions which might well have a hardening effect on their hearts. It was all too easy for the strict Jew to mistake his superficial exactness of observance for a genuine religious feeling which he was far from experiencing. A glance at the *Mishnah* tractate called *Shabbath* leaves the reader overwhelmed by the number and the triviality of the prescriptions which burdened the pious Israelite. The rest on the Sabbath had been definitely enjoined by Exodus xx. 8, which runs: "*Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is a sabbath unto Jahweh, thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidervant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.*" The obvious meaning of the passage is perfectly clear, but it becomes complicated when the doctors attempt an exact definition of the words *labour* and *work*, for such a definition can only be given by making a complete list of every possible case in which a careless man might conceivably be *working* or *labouring* without realizing it.

In *Shabbath* (vii, 2) the list includes thirty-eight prohibitions, which seems fairly comprehensive. But this does not settle the question, for the careful student of the twenty-first prohibition (against *making a knot*) or the twenty-second (against *undoing a knot*) may well feel doubts as to exactly what constitutes a *knot*, and a whole chapter (xv) is devoted to

giving the decisions and opinions of the Rabbis on this vital problem. Again, a Jew is strictly forbidden to trace *two letters* on the Sabbath day. But this raises all kinds of difficulties—What letters can it refer to? From what alphabet? Formed by what hand or implement? *Shabbath* (xii, 3-6) does not rest till it has examined every conceivable hypothesis. And so it is throughout the work. Every word of every precept becomes the text of an interminable harangue, a pretext for quibblings and hair-splittings, pedantries and sophistries until the smooth course of ordinary life is seriously menaced. How, for instance, could all domestic affairs be completely interrupted for twenty-four hours? Who was to light the fires, or look after the animals, which could scarcely be expected to conform to an ultra-strict observance of the day of rest? One could go on piling up instances of such ridiculous and extravagant *cases* indefinitely. And yet, as I have said, it would be a serious mistake to regard the religion of the *Torah* as mere academic casuistry in which the deadweight of legalism had extinguished every gleam of genuine feeling. The profound and ardent gratitude which every good Jew felt for the *Torah* itself, as the special gift vouchsafed by Jahweh to his people, is sufficient proof to the contrary.

The real drawback of this passion for strict observance was the utter lack of proportion it engendered. In practice the neglect of some trivial ruling of the doctors aroused as much horror and indignation as a serious breach of the Law itself. A strict Jew would consider it nearly as reprehensible not to wear those woollen tassels or fringes called *zizith* (the *κράσπεδα* of the Gospels) on the border of his garment, or to put the little box (*mesusah*) containing certain parts of the book of Deuteronomy (vi. 4-9, and xi. 13-21) on the right-hand doorpost of his house, or to bind the *tephillim* (the *φυλακτήρια* of Matt. xxiii. 5) about his head and forearm before praying, as not to pray at all. Yet the pious man was supposed to spend much time in prayer, since he not only had to recite the *Shema* morning and evening and at midday, the *Shemoneh-Esreh*, or benedictions, at meal-times, and the special prayers linking him with the celebration of the two daily sacrifices of the Temple, but was also under obligation to take part in the communal prayers at the synagogue.

There is a danger of not making sufficient distinction between the ramifications of Rabbinical theory and the common practice of the people. If critics would bear the origin of the *Mishnah* in mind, they would be less likely to exaggerate its effects and to picture Judaism as bound and fettered by a kind of strait-jacket of legalism. A careful examination soon makes it clear that the academic discussions of the Schools and the somewhat pedantic formalism of the synagogue represent only one aspect of the Jewish religion.

[JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD THE TORAH]

B. Harvie Branscomb

JESUS LIVED at a time when the religion of his people was in a condition of change and development. There was an overlapping of old and new, a questioning of long-accepted practices and beliefs, a reiteration of ancient doctrines, the beginnings of new movements and organisations. There were crosscurrents and conflicting tendencies. The Judaism of the Talmudic period and the centuries which followed was in the making.

There were four different aspects of this development. In the first place, the Scriptures were established in a position of pre-eminent authority such as they had not formerly occupied. This is one of the significant aspects of the victory of the House of Hillel over the House of Shammai. The latter represented the appeal to tradition for the determination of the halacha, the former rather turned to the Scriptures for its deduction. The appearance of systems of hermeneutic rules for the proper interpretation of the text, the endeavour to establish the harmony of the oral tradition with the Scriptures seen in the Mishna and the Gemara, the development of the full doctrine of the Torah, . . . the multiplication of schools in which Hebrew youths were taught to read the Scriptures, these all bear witness to the fact that Judaism was completing the long process of development by which it became the religion of a book.

In the second place, it is unquestioned that the period was one of great ethical achievement, when the moral teachings of the great prophetic writers were assimilated and applied to the various aspects of the nation's life. The more humane and kindly spirit of the School of Hillel and its victory over that of Shammai sums up in a general way this ethical advance. It is seen perhaps best of all in the summaries of the law made by various rabbis. "What is hateful to thyself do not to thy neighbour; this is the whole law, the rest is commentary," said Hillel. Akiba said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; this is the greatest general principle of the law." In comment on this Ben Azzai said, "When God created Adam he made him in the likeness of God; this is a greater principle than that." These statements, summarising and defining the essence of Torah, reveal the depth and power of the ethical development of Judaism. It is also illustrated by the doctrine of holiness on its ethical side, the teaching, namely, that one should go beyond the specific commands in one's obedience to the Torah.

From *Jesus and the Law of Moses*, New York, 1930, pp. 256-79. Reprinted by permission of Harper & Brothers and the author.

In the third place, the genuine religious impulse of the period expressed itself also in an emphasis upon and elaboration of certain ritual performances. Righteousness on the premises which Judaism had inherited, involved the performance of various duties toward God in addition to duties toward one's fellow-men, and the first century witnessed a strengthening of this demand for ceremonial purity and ritual correctness. The elaboration and more exact definition of the scriptural laws of the Sabbath, the tithes, the cleanness and uncleanness of vessels and persons, the liturgical rules for prayers, and the like, found in the Mishna, were largely the work of this period and furnish indubitable evidence of the attention given to and emphasis laid upon these matters in Pharisaic thought. . . .

In the fourth place, this period of religious emphasis expressed itself in a movement of separation on the part of those who endeavoured to keep the law exactly from those who did not. In an attempt to make actual the ancient ideal of Ezra, a nation obedient to the law, Pharisaism organised the people into societies for the study and practice of Torah. Ezra had separated the nation from outsiders, Pharisaism took up the further task of separating the righteous from the unrighteous in Israel in order that they might not be led into transgression. Such separation involved social ostracism and certain economic penalties for those who did not keep the law. It resulted in great bitterness and ill-feeling on the part of the ostracised, and produced many expressions of contempt for and disdain towards the 'amme-ha-'ares which have been preserved in Talmudic literature. . . .

The work of Jesus stands directly in the centre of this fourfold development, though he anticipated in time the full development of certain of the movements mentioned. His ethical teaching was in line with and indeed was part of that ethical advance which Judaism accomplished during the period. The rabbinic parallels to his sayings are multitudinous. The summaries of the law of Hillel, Akiba and Ben Azzai just quoted and many of the sayings of Jesus are all of a piece. In his teachings the ethical insight of the best representatives of Pharisaism comes to clear and strong expression. But Jesus differed from the Pharisaic movement in the importance which he attached to the traditional ritual and ceremonial practices. He transformed the ethical ideal into an ethical imperative and in comparison with it relegated the ritual duties, even though commanded in Torah, to a distinctly secondary and practically unessential position. He definitely opposed the Pharisaic extension of the law of priestly purity to laymen. He violated the law of the Sabbath on numerous occasions in the performance of deeds which were of service to men. He ate from, or was willing to eat from, dishes that were unclean and to be lodged in houses where no effort was made to observe the laws of purity, in order thereby to "seek the lost." At the tables of the 'amme-ha-'ares he no doubt ate food from which the priestly dues and tithes had not been separated, and there is no evidence that he endeavoured to supply such payments himself subsequent to the meals, as the law permitted. He declared that the eating of prohibited foods or foods improperly prepared did not necessarily make one unclean in God's sight. Furthermore, it seems evident

that he perceived this relationship between the moral and the ritual quite clearly and consciously. . . . The ethical ideal which Judaism proclaimed he restated in terms of great clearness and force and declared that this ideal should be given the right of way in conduct at all times and under all circumstances.

But this could be maintained only by means of a new view of the Torah. Jesus' opponents were always ready to insist that love and service were commanded in the law, but they pointed out that other duties were imposed in plain words and that man was bound to obey these ceremonial and ritual precepts also. Love and service were general terms and one must not be led by them into actual violations of or disregard for God's explicit commands. Jesus interpreted the Torah, however, as a divine revelation in which limitless service in love to those in need was commanded—its other precepts were subordinate to that primary duty. . . .

A comparison of the view of Jesus with that of the Sadducees will serve to illustrate further his conception. According to this party, the oral law or tradition was without authority. They regarded it, to use one of Jesus' own phrases, as nothing more than "a tradition of men." But the written Torah they held to be binding in its entirety, and they would have agreed fully with the *baraita* in *Sanhedrin* . . . , "He who says that the whole Torah is from God with the exception of this or that verse which Moses uttered from his own mouth and not God, to him applies the judgment, 'The word of the Lord he has despised.'" Jesus, on the other hand, dealt with the written law as freely as he did with the oral. In both forms of the Torah he declared that the will of God was summed up in certain basic commands of a positive religious and ethical character, and that other precepts were to be disregarded whenever they came in conflict with these primary commands in any way. In one instance, the case of divorce, this meant denying the authority of the regulation completely—a denial in which Jesus comes nearest to breaking away from his general position as to the Torah. To such denials Sadduceism was opposed. Neither could it tolerate Jesus' free handling of the law of the Sabbath nor his complete subordination of the laws of unclean dishes, furniture, foods, and the like to a program of evangelisation of and service to the outcasts. That Jesus' opposition seems to us to have been chiefly directed against the Pharisaic view of the Torah is due to two facts. In the first place, the Pharisees controlled the religious life of the nation and with them Jesus was in constant contact. In the second place, since the oral law constituted the authoritative definition of the meaning of the written Torah, it was inevitable that the conflict should be concerned first of all with the provisions of this tradition and its binding authority be denied. We must not forget that Jesus was equally opposed to the Sadduceean interpretation of the divine will, nor that it was the Sadduceean "chief priests" who actively brought about his death.

It is important to observe that this work of Jesus, strengthening and enforcing the ethical aspects of Judaism to the neglect of its ceremonial and its formal or impersonal elements, did not rest upon any opposition

toward the formal or ritual side of the religion. It is only as these duties conflicted with his conception of righteousness in ethical terms that Jesus ignored or rejected them. This is shown by two facts. . . . On the one hand, Jesus did not set out to attack the ritual practices nor to formulate a doctrine of Torah which would eliminate them, his discussion of these matters being in answer to questions and criticisms of his conduct on the part of the Pharisees. On the other hand, . . . Jesus appreciated and respected the Temple and its services. Even allowing for the element of exaggeration in the prophetic utterance, there is nothing in the sayings of Jesus which reads like the words of Amos, "I hate, I despise your feasts, I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies." Jesus said: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, for ye tithe mint, anise, and cummin and have left undone weightier matters of the law," but he spoke of the Temple as sanctifying the vessels of its service and of God as dwelling in it.

The antagonism which developed between Jesus and the separatist Pharisaic bodies is now easy to understand. On the one hand, Jesus was strongly opposed to their effort to extend the ideal of priestly purity to the nation as a whole and to put this (represented by the rite of hand-washing) in the forefront of the requirements for membership in their order. He repudiated their emphasis on exactness of tithing and the laws of ceremonial cleanness. He denied the exclusive right of the scribal group to interpret the Torah and to hand down official decisions which were binding. He denied the authority of tradition and thus broke the shackles which bound Judaism so strongly to her past. In a word, he repudiated the whole system of Pharisaism, the binding force of tradition, the authority of the scribes, and, by implication, the interpretation of the Torah in terms of law. From their standpoint, Jesus disobeyed the Torah, beguiled the people into a disregard of its provisions, and substituted the authority of the individual conscience for the corporate judgment of the scribal body.

That Jesus thus viewed the multiform literature of the Jewish Scriptures as expressive of simply a few great principles, all of which could be subsumed under the fundamental command "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . ." and "thy neighbour as thyself," will, to some readers, seem too modern a point of view. It will serve somewhat to guarantee the historicity of the presentation as well as to illustrate from another angle the relation of Jesus' conception of the Torah to that of Judaism if we recall the fact that the scribes of Jesus' day were accustomed to speculate as to which was the chief command of the Torah. Three of the most famous of these summaries were quoted earlier in this chapter. A third is very suggestive. "R. Simlai said, Six hundred and thirteen precepts were given to Moses on Mt. Sinai. . . . David came and reduced them to eleven (Ps. xv, 2-5), then came Isaiah and reduced them to six (Is. xxxiii, 15), Micah brought them to three: 'What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justice, to love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God' (vi, 8). Then Amos established them as two. Seek me and live (v. 5). Then came Habbakuk and made the law to stand on one principle, 'The righteous shall live by his faith (ii, 4).'"

Such a summary of the law taken in connection with Hillel's citation of the Golden Rule and Akiba's summary which was the same as that of Jesus, gives the background and perhaps the genesis of Jesus' method of understanding the Torah. Some words of Abrahams, however, will guard us from misunderstanding these rabbinic summaries: "Naturally there was no intention in the Pharisaic authorities who thus reduced the law to a few general rules, to deny the obligation to fulfil the rest of the law. . . . When Akiba and Ben Azzai spoke of neighbourly love as the greatest fundamental law they meant such a general or basic commandment from which all the other commands could be deduced. . . . The rabbi was not discriminating between the importance or unimportance of laws so much as between their fundamental or derivative character." But it was just this last which Jesus did do. Certain laws he declared to be of supreme importance and others of virtually no significance. The basic difference between the two attitudes comes to light if one examine their effects. The followers of Jesus in time rejected large portions of the law while in Judaism exactly the opposite tendency resulted. To quote Abrahams again: "In Jewish theology an objection was raised to such summaries just because they would tend to throw stress on part of the Torah to the relative detriment of the rest." A passage in the Babylonian Talmud is expressive: ". . . These are the chief things of the Torah. Only these and not those? Say rather, these and those are the chief elements in the Torah."

The work and teaching of Jesus, then, comes out of the main stream of Jewish religious and ethical development. It was not a by-product nor in any sense an accident. The ethical teaching of Judaism he expressed in terms of permanent worth, while its ritual and ceremonial features he subordinated to a relatively insignificant position. In this way he intensified its ethical demands and by freeing it from its peculiarly ethnic features he prepared the way for the religion of Israel to become universal and international in character.

The attitude of Jesus to the Torah outlined above explains and illumines the early career of Paul.

In the first place, why did Saul of Tarsus give himself to the persecution of the infant church? Though intolerant, he was certainly neither blood-thirsty nor cruel. The church was not hostile to the leaders of Judaism, as Peter's speeches show, nor were the Christians themselves transgressors of the law to any greater extent than other members of the class of "people of the land." A good deal of ink has been consumed in an endeavour to explain Saul's zeal in persecution as due to a psychological involution in which his subconscious response to the Christian preaching appears consciously as an hatred of the faith.

A much simpler explanation seems at hand. Paul was not only gifted with a keen and penetrating intellect, but he was a trained rabbinic scholar. He was familiar with the events of the life of Jesus as narrated both by his enemies and his friends. He had heard his sayings recounted. And Paul saw that no matter how much one might claim to revere and honour

the Torah, this teaching was destructive of it in the accepted sense. To teach that the Torah contains certain fundamental positive principles which must always be put into practice even at the expense of definite commands of the Pentateuch was to destroy its very nature as law. For laws are exact and specific commands, and if precepts enjoining avoidance of certain foods, abstention from labour on the Sabbath, and others of a like nature were subject to violation whenever one felt that one might thereby "do good," they were no longer laws at all. If Jesus' teaching were accepted, the ultimate authority in religion would no longer be the Law of Moses but these very general moral principles. Such an interpretation of the law was a much more serious matter than mere disobedience to this or that commandment or even apostasy to the whole of the law. This teaching took elements in the scribal instruction of the people—the discussion of the chief commandment for example—and used them in such a way as to destroy the conception of a revealed Torah. There always had been and always would be violators of the law, publicans, robbers, "people of the land." This teaching was a more serious matter. It supported on principle the carelessness and indifference of the 'amme-ha-'ares toward various commandments. It furnished to the lawless multitude a justification for much that they would like to do. Thus it struck at the root of Judaism, the validity and authority of the Torah, oral and written. This is not to deny that other factors entered into Saul's motives, the opposition of Jesus to the scribes and Pharisees for example, no doubt also the instinctive response of Saul's mind, psychologically conditioned by his Hellenistic experiences, to Jesus' teaching. But I do suggest as the fundamental reason for Saul's program of persecution, the perception by his trained mind that here was a teaching which was destructive of Pharisaism.

The hypothesis that this was the attitude of Jesus and that Saul clearly understood its implications receives weighty confirmation from his thought and preaching after his conversion. He declared that the law had run its course, that it was no longer binding, and that righteousness was to be defined in terms of a general moral principle. What is the explanation of so complete and sudden a reversal of his former position, the promulgation of a doctrine so subversive of everything Judaistic? The explanation has been sought in his unsatisfactory religious experience under the law, but the cause is inadequate to explain the results. Paul's Hellenistic background has also been cited and was, of course, a factor of primary importance, but neither can this alone account for so radical a change. Now it is important to observe the exact position which Paul adopted with reference to the law. He declared that it was no longer binding as law, neither in its ceremonial nor in its moral aspects, but was valid as expressing certain underlying ethical principles. In both his major discussions of the function of the law he is at pains to make this clear. He concludes his letter to his Galatian converts with the summary, "For the whole law is fulfilled in this one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." To the Roman Christians he develops the thought at greater length: "Owe no man anything, save to love one another: for he that loveth his neigh-

bour hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: love therefore is the fulfillment of the law." It is impossible that Paul wrote these words in ignorance of the teachings of Jesus on obedience to the Torah. It is also impossible that on such a crucial point Paul's views could have been at variance with his conception of the teachings of his Lord. As a result of this study Paul stands out in a new and stronger light as an interpreter and exponent of the teachings of Jesus. He was not an innovator who in this vital respect turned the course of the Christian movement.

TARSUS

T. R. Glover

I

WHEN PAUL told Claudius Lysias that he was a Tarsian, "a citizen of no mean city"—a city "not inconspicuous"—he was not speaking idly. Legend said it was founded by one of the Argives, who, with Triptolemos, sought Io, when she was turned into a cow. Xenophon had been there some four centuries or so before Paul's day, and found the palace of a Cilician King Syennesis. The Greek mercenaries of Cyrus signalized their stay first by looting in the city, and then by a mutiny which Clearchus and Cyrus settled by a 50 per cent rise in pay. Antiochus Epiphanes, it is inferred, settled Jews as colonists there in 171 B.C. The place had a name for a famous Stoic school; and visitors from other Greek regions of the Mediterranean found a pleasing conservatism in Tarsus, as Chicago people perhaps do still in Boston. Modern travellers speak of the scenery round Tarsus as magnificent; and it is remarked that Paul never alluded to it. . . .

If we follow Socrates' example and ask what men had to teach in the city, we learn that long before the Roman times Tarsus was a centre of Greek culture. Strabo, who wrote or compiled his geography about the Christian Era, says that the Tarsians had an enthusiasm for philosophy, and for education generally, that outwent Athenians and Alexandrians or any other citizens of what we should call university towns; nearly all the students in Tarsus are natives, strangers rarely come, but the Tarsians go abroad to study, and they are rather apt to stay abroad when they have got their education. In other such places, Alexandria excepted, the students are strangers, and the natives rarely study either in their own universities or anywhere else—which suggests modern Cambridge and Oxford, while Tarsus is perhaps more like Aberdeen. Strabo speaks of Stoic studies flourishing, and mentions by name five eminent Stoics, one a friend of Marcus Cato, another of Caesar; he adds the names of a great Academic (the tutor of Augustus' nephew Marcellus), and of others, all men of Tarsus; "Rome is full of them and of Alexandrians."

Tarsus was a "free city" from Antony's time; it paid no tribute, and it had self-government. Dio Chrysostom speaks of the workers in sailcloth at Tarsus, and of their repute for being many in number and disorderly in ways, and their uneasy position in the city, of which however they are not full citizens; and he urges the concession of full rights to them. Readers of the Acts will recall that Paul in his day worked at the trade;

From *Paul of Tarsus*, London, 1925, pp. 5-23. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Student Christian Movement Press.

and the suggestion is easy that Aquila and Priscilla may have been Tarsians themselves (Acts xviii. 3).

The river Cydnus, Strabo tells us, flows through the city, hard by the young men's gymnasium—a cool and headlong stream. With one last scene on this river recalled to mind, we may pass from the “not inconspicuous city” to its most famous citizen. It was here that Cleopatra came to meet Antony “sailing up the river Cydnus, in a barge with gilded stern and outspread sails of purple, while oars of silver beat time to the music of flutes and fifes and harps. She herself lay at full length under a canopy of gold, dressed like Venus in a picture, and beautiful boys, like painted Cupids, stood on each side to fan her. Her maids were attired like Sea Nymphs and Graces, some steering at the rudder, some working at the ropes.” So Plutarch; and English readers will know where to turn for a more splendid version drawn, like so much else, by our greatest dramatist from Plutarch.

That Paul's family, or at least his father, enjoyed Roman citizenship, he tells us himself, when he informs Claudius Lysias that he was “born free.” How the citizenship was gained, whether for services rendered or for money, or on the manumission of an enslaved ancestor, we do not know. Paul says more of the Jewish traditions of the family; they were Benjamites as he twice tells us (Phil. iii. 5; Rom. xi. 1), Hebrews of the Hebrews; and it has been an easy and profitless conjecture that he owed his Hebrew name Saul to memories of the tribe's one king. The social and financial position of the family has been much discussed, and we cannot quite escape it; but the fact that Paul at one time worked at a trade has to be ruled out as evidence. It appears that it was usual for a young Jew to learn a trade; at least the rabbis are quoted as inculcating this upon parents. It has been conjectured that Paul's father may have been concerned with the sale of the fabric in the markets of the East. Travel seems to have come naturally to Paul, but that cannot be pressed as an argument. He alludes to his “kin”—Junia and Lucius bearing Roman names, and others Greek; and the list in which they appear is now in his Epistle to the Romans, whatever may be the value of guesses as to how it came there. But with a people, who shifted about the world as the Jews have done since Alexander the Great, there is no telling where these “kin” belonged. A nephew lived, or at one time resided, in Jerusalem (Acts xxiii. 16). It was common for Jews, then as now, to have Gentile names, which sometimes suggest their own. Thus Joshua might be Hellenized as Jesus, or transformed into Jason or Justus. A Roman citizen took a Roman name, as the satirist reminds us in his sardonic picture of the change of Dama into Marcus, to the great improvement of his character. But however the name Paullus came to the family whom we are now considering, Paul inherited the name, and, as we shall see, a good deal of the Roman with it.

It has been pointed out that, while Jesus was conspicuously a man of fields and country towns, Paul, as plainly, in allusion, metaphor, and illustration, shows that he is a man of the city, and, further, that he had been a boy there. If we trace back his metaphors to their first appearance in his mind, we shall see the boy on his way through the streets of Tarsus stopping to

watch the builders at the new house—how the wise master-builder (*architecton*) draws the cords and lays the foundation and another builds on it, and how sometimes the work of the latter has to be taken down and done over again; and the boy hears that the man's wages are reduced for his bad work (1 Cor. iii. 10). Or a wrong-headed labourer breaks brickwork down and has to rebuild it (Gal. ii. 18). Later in life he has many hints of the scene, disguised in our English version by the rather obsolete word *edify*. He has the boy's interest in shops—none the less that in the Orient there were no huge plate-glass windows, no departmental stores with hordes of shop-girls, but that barter prevailed, and all the shops of a kind were in a row and more or less open, as they are in the bazars of Smyrna or Calcutta to-day. Here are the butchers (1 Cor. x. 25) with the perplexities that grow for a boy about the distinctions between *Kosher* and other meat, and the carcasses of pagan sacrifice; there again are other traders, huckstering, wheedling, and bargaining, illustrating everything that led the Greek to his contempt for "shop-keeping" (*kapeleuo*). Paul later on repudiates that style of procedure in recommending the word of God; it does not need tricks; give it sunlight and sincerity and God looking on, and it will do (2 Cor. ii. 17). It is noted, further, that he uses metaphors of debt, and of the market, and "calculates."

Slaves no doubt abounded, as they did not in Galilee, though Tarsus certainly must have had much fewer than Rome; and Paul, like other boys in Greek and Hellenistic towns, probably got his first conceptions of the world's variety of races from the sorrowful figures of slaves. He does not allude to the slave-market, but he must have seen it; and he does speak of the branded slave (Gal. vi. 17). One can imagine the small boy's bright interest in recognizing one of the Greek letters he was learning on the side of a man's brow, and how indelible would be the memory of his first discovery of the cruelty that men could show to men. Another day, soldiers marched through the streets perhaps, rough enough, though not conquerors in a free town; and perhaps, as a very small boy to-day will find acute pleasure in a Salvation Army band, the small Saul was impressed with the trumpets, and it was explained to him that the trumpet was blown to tell the soldier when to get ready for march or battle (1 Cor. xiv. 8). Later on, he draws many illustrations from the soldier's life (2 Cor. x. 2-5; 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4). The custom-house perhaps did not claim the boy's attention at the beginning, any more than the tax-collector; but they were part of the city-life, and Paul the traveller must eventually have seen as much as he wanted of the former at least (Rom. xiii. 6-7). The publican comes oftener in the talk of Jesus.

But if shops and slaves and soldiers formed a part of Tarsus life, a Hellenistic city had more variety to offer in its amusements. We have already had an illusion to the gymnasium of Tarsus. It was a matter of amusement to the Greek that Orientals were so fussy about being seen naked; they laughed at the very white bodies of their captives, when Agesilaus had been stripped to be sold. On their side the Jews were shocked at Greek nudity. In the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, among the lawless

enormities of Jason, who bought the High Priesthood and set about Hellenizing Jerusalem and making a little Antioch of the sacred city, the historian notes with horror the establishment of a gymnasium and the introduction of the broad-brimmed Greek *petasos*. "He gladly planted a gymnasium under the acropolis itself, and the strongest (or noblest) of our youths he brought under the Greek hat" (2 Macc. iv. 6). To the modern in the West all this seems very innocent, but in the East race and faith are in a turban to this day. "In God's name wear red for blue," says Mahbub Ali to Kim—the Muslim colour not the Hindu. Bombay has some sixty varieties of turban, all with significance, and pictured in the *Gazetteer* of the city. But Jerusalem and Tarsus were far apart; distance, environment and the lapse of two centuries changed things. Children are not particular about caste or colour if the other boy has points of contact; and there is something about the running of a race that captures the boy's mind, even if it is naked Greeks—or, even worse, Hellenizing half-Greeks—who are running. If we cannot certainly answer the question, Was he allowed to watch the heathen at their athletics? it is easier to answer the question, Did he watch them?

Paul, it must be recognized, kept something of the boy's mind to the very end, the boy's easy gift of "making friends with fellows," the boy's keenness—his very tangents of thought show it. "Don't you know that the runners in the stadium all run and only one gets the prize? *Run to win!*" (1 Cor. ix. 24). And this reprobate Jew, who had in his boyhood watched the Greek heathen at their sports, forgetful of old Jewish proprieties and Greek indecencies, goes on to make it clear, not only that he had been interested in racing, but in boxing. He does not "run uncertainly," he says, and we can believe it; he will know which end of the course he has to reach and keep his eye on it, and "run to win." When he boxes he will not waste his blows on the air; the other man shall know that he can punch (so men found who ventured on controversy with him); and he will keep fit like a good athlete. The whole passage is illuminative. Paul is not "drawing illustrations from local interests" any more than Jesus thinks out allusions to "natural objects"; the racing and the boxing interested him. Of course they did; and one might guess that there were Tarsians, who, if they read his letters, could have borne personal testimony to his not hitting the air when he fought as a boy, as well as to his keenness in running. From the energy of the man, his extraordinary powers of physical endurance, the vitality of his mind, it is not too much to conclude that if he took no part as a youth in the gymnasium, the stadium and the wrestling ground, it was not because he would not have liked it; the reasons must be looked for in nationalism and religious tradition, and the life of renunciation began before his 'teens. One is not a Hebrew of Hebrews for nothing. But even in antiquity children played, and fought, and ran races. Epictetus tells what they played; they were "sometimes athletes, sometimes monomachi, sometimes gladiators."

The theatre was another feature of Greek life to be found wherever the Greek went, an obvious factor in all Hellenization, pagan through and

through. Running was human, boxing, too, and soldiering; but the stage was idolatrous, the play was a heathen ceremony in essence, its arguments were drawn from legends of false gods, and the performance was liable to be grossly indecent—"a ligge or a tale of baudry." Yet the Jews, as we learn from an inscription, had a special place assigned to them in the theatre at Miletus. If the son of strict Jews might not go to the theatre, he knew all about it. "We are made a spectacle (*theatron*) to the world, to angels and to men," he says (1 Cor. iv. 9); he plays Hecuba himself, with all the universe looking on; the sight

Would have made milche the Burning eyes of Heaven
And passion in the Gods.

Life in a Greek or Oriental town was carried on a good deal out of doors. "The city teaches the man," as Simonides said—*πόλις ἄνδρα διδάσκει*. Paul began to learn what we call his universalism in the streets of Tarsus as a boy, too human to feel that the other boys were not human too, whatever he was taught within doors, even if actually for a while he persuaded himself to believe it. We must not forget that life in a Hellenistic city might influence him by moods of antipathy. The family was obviously a strict one, as Pharisee in outlook and practice as the foreign soil allowed; the discipline and the name implied division and separation, and Greeks were not always genial to Jews. We must not forget the training of the home. But here, too, in spite of himself, the household helped to broaden the boy's outlook. It was inevitable.

The two great languages of the nearer East were Greek and Syriac, to which the Aramaic of Palestine is closely akin. Tarsus stands where the two met, a frontier town. Westward, thought and speech were Greek; eastward, and very far and significantly eastward, thought and speech were Syriac. Westward lay philosophy and literature. Syriac seems never to have had much literature till it became a Christian speech. How far eastward it reached is not always realized, but of late years Syriac books and script have been found in Turkestan. I have myself been present at a Christian service in Calcutta, when a liturgy was conducted in Syriac by men calling themselves Syrians, whose ancestors had been Christians in India longer perhaps than the Anglo-Saxon stock, Christian or pagan, had been in England at all. In China, at Si-ngan-fu, stands a Syrian Christian monument, conspicuous among all the inscriptions of the Church. Greek and Aramaic in some form were inevitable in Paul's upbringing. Luke tells us, further, that Paul made a speech at Jerusalem in Hebrew without preparation (Acts xxi. 40). Conceivably the speech may have been in Aramaic; Yiddish is often called Hebrew to-day. It is likely that Paul learnt Hebrew and read the Old Testament in Hebrew, but it is clear that he knew the book best in the Septuagint version. His religious and ethical vocabulary, his quotations, alike show that it was not the Hebrew but the Greek Bible that was in his heart. A hint of a play on words, as impossible in Greek as in English, suggests that he at least sometimes thought in

Aramaic; "long hair" and "disgrace" are not an assonance in Greek, but in Aramaic they are. It is hardly thinkable that, in all his intercourse with Roman officials and magistrates, he knew no Latin. There was not the Greek's contempt for that barbarian tongue to stop him, and even Greeks, though shaky now and then like Plutarch in Latin grammar, knew more of the language than they pretended.

An argument has been put forward by a learned German scholar [Deissmann] that Paul "did not come from the literary upper class, but from the artisan non-literary classes, and that he remained with them"; that he was a tent-maker "whose trade was the economic foundation of his existence," who worked night and day (1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8), who wrote in "large letters" (Gal. vi. 11), clumsily and awkwardly, with "a workman's hand deformed by toil," and preferred an amanuensis. Poverty it is plain that Paul knew, at all events in Corinth and in Thessalonica. But Wendland is probably right in denying Deissmann's thesis outright, and asserting categorically that Paul was not of the lower class, either in social status or education, and that to count his language vulgar and non-literary is an unjustifiable application of Attic standards—though he allows that Paul's is not yet a triumphant style. He certainly was suspected by Felix of being able to lay his hands on money (Acts xxiv. 26); and in Rome he had his own hired house (Acts xxviii, 30).

We learn from the Acts that, at an age which we are left to conjecture, Paul removed, or was taken, to Jerusalem. There, according to Paul's speech as given by Luke, Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3). Whatever be the part of Luke or of other historians in reporting the speeches of their heroes, there need be no hesitation in accepting the statement that Paul was the pupil of Gamaliel. Though we are not told at what age he left Tarsus and came to Jerusalem, the question is not without importance. The only available evidence is eternal. That Greek was his native speech is proved, says Wendland, by his familiarity with the Septuagint. Casual references and broken quotations will tell what text or edition of a book a man has read; and these, with passages, where Paul bases arguments on the Greek which would not rest on the Hebrew, prove that he used the Greek Bible. Deissmann ably deduces from his being a man of the Septuagint a later date than childhood for his leaving Tarsus; he must have spent a good part of his youth, or at least his boyhood, there. His "sovereign command of Hellenistic colloquial" points in the same direction, and that general familiarity, which we have remarked, with the ordinary life of a Hellenistic town. It is held by another scholar that all his Hebraisms are due to the Septuagint, with the addition of a few Hebrew words, while now and then, if he happens to translate from the Hebrew, a hint of its structure can be seen in his Greek.

Greek then is his mother-tongue, and Greek his milieu—in neither case the Greek of the great classical period; he belongs to the Graeco-Roman world, but his background is Semitic, and his religion Hebrew. He thus stands at the centre of things, equipped for the very task he was to undertake, the interpretation of Christ to the heart of the world. But before we

consider his capture by Christ, we have to look more closely at the influences that played upon him and to see, if possible, how far they shaped him. If our course for the time is devious, if it yields little in positive statement about the man himself, it will enable us to see a little more of that Graeco-Roman world, which, if it did not influence him as directly this way or that way as some have held, was yet his home and his battleground. The time should not be quite wasted.

II

The interests of ordinary life in a Hellenistic town we have seen to be among the early associations of Paul. But Hellenistic life and Greek thought are two different things; the Hellene remained a different creature from his neighbors who shared his ideas and his outlook, different even if they had any element of Greek blood in their veins. The theatre and the gymnasium passed more easily into men's habits than Greek discipline into their minds. Men in that age of travel and talk picked up in popular lectures and conversation more ideas than they ever thought out, much as people do in newspapers and novels and on trains to-day. They learnt the language and even something of the style of Greece; but the Greek spirit was not so easily caught. No example perhaps can be so telling as that of Plutarch himself; he was Greek by blood and Greek by birth; he was steeped in the history, the literature, and the philosophy of the older Greece; but, however much it might have surprised him to be told so, no one could be much further from the mind and outlook of Plato.

But to sum up his relations with Stoicism. The school coined the language; the roving lectures and the audiences that quoted them gave it currency; it came to Paul. He slid, as we also do, into using the speech of our day, where it coincides with what we observe to be true. The Stoics and their followers pointed to a great correspondence between what we may call, in antithesis, Nature and human nature; they are made for one another; there are laws of Nature, and these are also the laws of human nature. Conscience is that operation of the human mind, that function, aspect or part of it, by which we become aware of these laws. Nature and Conscience work together, just as Paul says. If it was a nominally heathen Greek who pointed it out, a good Jew can verify it in the real world which the true God made, and can find (as our passage shows) a hint in Jeremiah that the true God intended the link between Man and all Nature—the union, the community, of all God's works—to be discovered. If Paul, as we should suppose, absorbed these ideas from current phase and the common stock of axiomatic ideas, we deduce not a Stoic school or a Stoic teacher, but a cosmopolitan world in which ideas are no longer private or racial property—a world conscious through the terms it shares of a common experience and an interest in every man's experience of God. And from other sources we know that this was the milieu in which a cosmopolitan Jew of Paul's day must move, whatever his powers of resistance or assimilation.

Paul, then, is not a man regularly trained in Greek culture; he is, as he

avows, not a product of the schools; nor is he a philosopher, if philosophers pure and simple at all survived and philosophy were not merged in ethics and psychology. His traditions are those of orthodox Judaism; he conceived himself to be an orthodox Jew. But an open mind in such a world receives impressions from many sources, and he could not use Greek speech unreflectively. It was bound to tell upon him and it did. He met the Greek spirit in Tarsus, city of athletes, rhetoricians and Stoics, and the very fact that his Scriptures were in Greek secured the influence of that spirit; he was to be a man of all the world. But meanwhile he was a young Jew and orthodox.

“AND THE ROCK WAS CHRIST”

Wilfred L. Knox

IN HIS FIRST visit to Corinth Paul would seem to have been content to confine himself to the ordinary eschatological tradition of Palestinian Christianity; he was mainly concerned with Jews, proselytes and adherents of the synagogue. But his visit to Athens had shown that the emphasis must be transferred from the end of all things to the beginning if the educated Greek world was to be won for the Gospel, and he was perfectly aware of the necessity when he arrived in Corinth; when at a later stage the Corinthians began to display an excessive pride in their intellectual gifts, he was able to point out that he had merely preached to them an elementary version of the Gospel, not the deeper mysteries reserved for the more advanced Christian; he had given them milk and not meat. He had already realised the need of a presentation more suited to the learned world, and had already worked it out.

The change of system involved no serious difficulty. The figure of the Messiah was drawn from circles of Jewish thought which were concerned not with the beginning of all things but with the end. But the apocalyptic hope of Israel had been fitted into the general scheme of Judaism by the rabbis. If the Messiah was destined to appear as a full-grown man in a future so near at hand that it was worth while endeavouring to compute the times and seasons, it followed that he must already exist in the scheme of things. It might be held that he had already been born and was waiting until the time when Elijah should reveal to him the knowledge of his vocation, or that he had been caught away to a place prepared by God until the time for his manifestation should come. If he were already in existence, it could do no harm to put his origin back to the beginning of all things; if he were part of God's eternal purpose, he must always have had a kind of existence. It was generally agreed that the Torah had existed from all eternity, and if the Torah had existed from all eternity, it followed that Moses had existed in the same way, for it was hard to suppose that the Torah could be dissociated from him. But such beliefs were mere expressions of midrashic piety, analogous to those in which Judaism was prepared to glorify the heroes of the Old Testament, to whom it attributed exploits suspiciously similar to those of the divine heroes of the Hellenistic world. In the same way the Temple might have pre-existed from all eternity; the view may have been derived from the Oriental belief that earthly sanctuaries are a copy of heaven, which seems to underlie the language of Exod. 25.9. Naturally Hellenistic Jewish writers associated this

From *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, Cambridge, 1939, pp. 111-24. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Cambridge University Press.

view with Plato's doctrine of ideas; here again he had borrowed from Moses. All this was a mere glorification of the religion of Judaism; it was not intended to be taken seriously, except in so far as it implied the unique character of God's revelation to Israel; or in the case of the Messiah it was a fanciful attempt to explain the problem of his sudden appearance as a full-grown man. It could never have led to an association of the Messiah with the work of creation, for this belonged to an entirely different aspect of Jewish thought. The unimportance of his pre-existence is shown by the ease with which the celestial pre-existences were at a later stage, perhaps in answer to Christianity, increased to seven by the addition to the Torah, the Temple and the Messiah, of heaven, hell, repentance and the throne of God. By himself the pre-existent Messiah could never have obtained a rôle in the cosmogony of Judaism.

But it was easy for Paul to find a terminology in which he could adapt the figure of Jesus, regarded as the centre of the life of the Church, to the fashionable cosmogony of the Hellenistic world. The speculations of Alexandrine Judaism had accommodated the book of Genesis to the syncretised system of philosophy in vogue at Alexandria; and these speculations would seem to have been fairly well known in Jerusalem itself. The later rabbinical writings recognise the existence of a cosmic "beginning" which is at once the Wisdom of Proverbs 8.22 and the Torah; it seems likely that they are survivals of an earlier time when speculation on these matters was less hampered by the necessity of avoiding the danger of Christian arguments that the cosmic "beginning," in which God had made the world, was Jesus the divine Logos. In any case this "beginning" was equated with the Torah. There is some evidence that speculations of an Alexandrine type, associated with the name of "Hermes," had been known to rabbinical Judaism at a time when it was sufficiently sure of its position to admit the speculations of the Egyptian sage, presumably in view of his unconscious testimony to the truth of the divine revelation given to Moses. Such speculations, however, were never concerned with the Messiah, who belonged to a circle of ideas which had no contact with cosmogony; by the middle of the second century A.D. they were too closely identified with Christianity to be familiar to the Judaism of Palestine; they were regarded as the property of the Alexandrines, in whose speculations the Messiah had little or no place. For at Alexandria the Messiah was relegated to the background or even explained away as a prophetic type of the Logos; he had no real reason for existence in that sphere of Jewish thought, which was quite without interest in the end of the world-process and only concerned with its beginning. Thus it is possible that Paul was acquainted even before his conversion with Jewish speculations which substituted for the Messiah the divine reason immanent in the cosmos and identified it with the Spirit of God which inspired Moses and the prophets, and regarded it as possessing some special affinity with the element of mind or spirit which was the highest element in the soul of man, or at any rate in the soul of the righteous. In any case he was bound to meet them in the synagogues of the Disper-

sion, where the popular philosophy of the age was the common property of educated Jews.

Since Jesus, as the Messiah, raised man above the power of the planets, it was natural to suppose that He came from the sphere above them, which was eternal; consequently He was not merely superior to them in space, but also before them in the order of time, or rather eternal, whereas they were temporal. It was therefore an easy matter for Paul in writing his first letter to Corinth to transfer the person of the historical Jesus from the category of the heavenly Messiah of Palestinian Judaism and Christianity into that of the divine Wisdom which was the centre of Hellenistic-Jewish speculation, where the term Logos had not yet ousted it under the influence of Philo. The panegyric of the wisdom of God, as manifested in the Cross, shows the case with which the Messianic and the cosmic lines of thought could be conflated; it is possible that they show the process by which Paul arrived at his conflation. Formally he is concerned to contrast the wisdom of God with the wisdom on which the Corinthians pride themselves (1 Cor. 1. 18 seq.). The Cross might appear foolishness to the Greeks and be a stumbling-block to the Jews; but it was Christ, the power and wisdom of God; the quarrels of the Corinthians and their love for the manifestation of the spiritual gifts on which they prided themselves were examples of the foolishness and weakness of the world, which wrongly regarded itself as wisdom and power. The contrast was dictated by the circumstances in which the letter was written. The description of Jesus as the power and wisdom of God might simply describe the Messiah, who could be associated with the wisdom of God's purpose as easily as with the more normal thought of His power. In particular Paul used the outpouring of the power of God in Jesus as the Messiah to point out the contrast between the fear and weakness of his own preaching at Corinth and the outpouring of the Spirit and the signs and wonders which accompanied that preaching. He still retained the Messianic category, when he described Jesus as the wisdom of God, which had been hidden even from the spiritual rulers of the universe, who in their ignorance had crucified the Lord of glory, but was now made manifest by the revelation of the secret purposes of God: the word "mystery" here retained its proper Jewish sense of a divine secret, hitherto concealed, but now revealed.

Up to this point the exposition had not necessarily implied that Jesus was the "power" and "wisdom" of God in any sense in which these terms might not be used of the Messiah as the revelation of God's purpose and the means of its fulfilment. But at 2.10 Paul turned abruptly from Jesus as the Messianic revelation of the Wisdom and the power of God to the apparently irrelevant spirit by which the Christian was able to understand the deep things of God. The "spirit" is the highest element in man, in virtue of which he knows his own affairs. In the same way man could not know the things of God except by the Spirit of God.

The "spiritual" man had received that gift; the man who possessed only the natural soul had not received it and therefore could not understand the things of God. Paul claimed for himself, and for all other Christians

who like himself were "spiritual," that they had received a gift of the Spirit, which enabled them to understand the gifts which God had bestowed on man and to teach with a wisdom higher than human wisdom, a wisdom that was taught them by the Spirit. The ordinary man, having a soul but not the Spirit, could not receive such teaching, which needed the Spirit if it was to be understood. No man knows the mind of the Lord, so as to be able to instruct Him; but the natural man who criticises the spiritual man is in effect trying to do so, for he is criticising the mind of Christ, as possessed by the spiritual Christian.

The force of the argument depended on the conception by which the prophetic spirit of God in the Old Testament was equated with the divine Mind or Spirit permeating the cosmos, and also with that divine *afflatus* which was present in the best and wisest of mankind. Thus Paul and those like him possessed that immunity from criticism which was the prerogative of the Stoic wise man, but they possessed a far higher right to it. For the divine element in the Stoic wise man was with difficulty differentiated from the divine element present in human nature as such; the distinction was made, but not very clearly maintained, except where the divine element was a special prerogative of those exalted souls whose powers or virtues seemed to raise them above normal humanity. Paul's equation of the Spirit with the mind of Christ made it abundantly clear that the Spirit was a special gift of God, not a property of the soul of man as such. The further question of the relation of the historical Jesus to the divine power immanent in the cosmos and specially manifested as a divine gift in the highest type of Christian was one which Paul did not raise, any more than he asked how it was possible to relate the element of "spirit" which was an essential part of human nature (2. 11 ascribes a "spirit" of some kind to all men who are capable of managing their own affairs) to the Spirit of God, or how it was possible to describe the Corinthians as merely psychic, if they actually possessed a human "spirit." The lack of clarity was characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism, which was bound to retain the Spirit of God, which inspired the prophets, as something separate from human nature as such, but yet was quite ready to accept the idea of a divine element in man representing the "image of God" in which man was created. Paul, if pressed for an answer, would probably have retorted that the question was one which only concerned the wisdom of the world, and that the wisdom of the world was foolishness with God. He would at least have had the justification that the wisdom of the world was entirely chaotic in its attempt to answer precisely these questions.

Thus Paul's claim for immunity from criticism was based on the possession of a divine gift of the Spirit, which was nothing less than the mind of the Lord (2. 16). The words of Is. 40. 13 proved the folly of trying to teach God; His purpose in creation was entirely above man's comprehension. But that purpose in creation was simply the divine Wisdom; and that Wisdom was the possession of the spiritual Christian, who possessed in the Spirit the mind of Christ, the Wisdom of God. Thus the purpose of God, His Wisdom hitherto concealed but now revealed in the Messianic

figure of Jesus, is also the creative Wisdom which was with God in the first beginning of creation; the whole argument depends for its force on this equation of Jesus with the cosmic Wisdom, and the further equation of that Wisdom with the divine Spirit immanent in the cosmos, yet vouchsafed to the Christian, or at least to the spiritual Christian. The transformation of the Messiah into the divine Wisdom was thus complete; it is at least possible that Paul had arrived at his reinterpretation of the person of Jesus in terms of cosmogony through an established convention, which equated the hidden Wisdom of God's purpose in the Messiah with the Wisdom which was His counsellor in the creation of the cosmos. The claim to a specially privileged position for the Apostle and other "spiritual" Christians was of course only introduced to rebuke the Corinthians for their spiritual pride; their "psychic" condition was a mark of their inferiority to the normal Christian who was "in Christ" and therefore possessed His "spirit" or "mind."

At a later stage in the Epistle Paul made it clear that the possession of the gifts of the Spirit ought to be a mark of the normal Christian as such. He was concerned to correct the disorders, which had grown up at Corinth as a result of an excessive concern with the abnormal spiritual manifestations familiar to primitive Christianity. Such manifestations had ceased to play any considerable part in the religion of educated circles in the Hellenistic world. Ecstatic prophecy was confined to a few of the less reputable cults, especially those of Syrian origin. Prophecy as one form of the power of divining the future had been accepted by Posidonius and therefore was philosophically respectable, and Judaism naturally welcomed this confirmation of the Old Testament. But Judaism was careful to minimise the ecstatic element of prophecy; mystical contemplation and piety rather than frenzied eloquence are the mark of the prophet as described by Philo. In the synagogue prophecy had ceased except in so far as it lingered, an impressive but peculiar phenomenon, among the Essenes and similar sects. Christianity had however revived the tradition of the Old Testament in this respect, though the temper and tradition inherited from the synagogue kept it within reasonable limits in most of the Churches. At Corinth, where that tradition had grown weak with the influx of Gentile converts and the departure of the Jewish refugees from Rome who had formed a large part of the original community, such enthusiasms threatened to become a serious nuisance. Paul found himself compelled to work for the suppression of the more dramatic manifestations of the "Spirit" even at the cost of a good apologetic argument. The simple-minded observer in such a city as Corinth was hardly likely to be so deeply impressed by ethical gifts as by those frenzied outpourings which had in the past won classical Greece for the worship of Dionysus, and could not fail to attract the mixed Levantine population of a great port. But if the educated world was to be converted, the "Spirit" must be a divine power, animating the world in general with a divine life, and animating the virtuous man and raising him to a higher stage of goodness.

In transforming Christian worship from an exhibition of ecstatic phe-

nomena into an orderly system based on that of the synagogue, Paul was only restoring it to its normal character; for it is clear that he regarded the state of affairs at Corinth as a mere parody of what Christian worship should be. Speaking with tongues and prophecies were only tolerable if they were isolated incidents in a generally orderly procedure. He supported his reformation by an appeal to the conventional argument of Hellenistic Judaism; the synagogue was commonly represented as a meeting for the discussion of the true philosophy; it had been instituted by Moses in his character of the father of philosophy; it was therefore to be desired that the meetings of the Church should impress the visitor with that shame and penitence which all but the most abandoned would feel on entering a meeting at which a philosopher was delivering an ethical homily of the kind which was popular at the period.

But while Paul was prepared to borrow arguments from philosophy, and to present Christianity in terms of the cosmogony of the age in which he lived, he was entirely indifferent to philosophy as such. Love alone was eternal; for love was the fulfilling of the Torah (Rom. 13. 8) and therefore could abide, when prophecies had ceased to have any meaning, when speaking with tongues had ceased and when knowledge, whether in the form of rabbinical learning or the mystical knowledge of God, had been done away. For all such partial means of knowing were only intended for the present life, in which man was still in the state of a child. Here, like the prophets, he had only glimpses of God seen as in a mirror through riddles; naturally Moses' vision was no better. Full knowledge could only come when man could see God face to face and attain to that knowledge of Him which He possessed of man; it was only in virtue of God's cognisance of him that man had any knowledge of God. The thought was drawn from popular theology, which here harmonised with the outlook of Judaism; for Judaism was essentially a religion which emphasised the divine initiative in the relations between God and man; God had "known" Israel and the prophets, and it was natural that His "knowledge" of the prophets should be extended to all Christians who possessed the "Spirit," for they were greater than the prophets. It was perhaps an advantage of the thought that it made "Gnosis" depend upon an act of God towards man and therefore depreciated the value of that knowledge on which the Corinthians prided themselves.

The effect of 1 Cor. 13 was to harmonise the "Spirit" of God as manifested in the Church with the Wisdom of God as interpreted in the light of the later Stoic tradition by the author of Wisdom; there is no evidence that Paul was acquainted with this work, but the book of Wisdom was merely one specimen of a larger body of traditional exegesis. Paul's familiarity with this exegesis and the decisive proof that in writing to the Corinthians he had in mind the equation of the historical Jesus with the Wisdom of the Hellenistic synagogues appear in 1 Cor. 10 1 *seqq.* The *kerygma* of the mighty works of God in delivering His people from Egypt was an established form of missionary preaching. It could not be doubted that this deliverance was the work of God himself; rash speculations which

ascribed it to an angel could only be condemned, as they were actually condemned by the writer of Is. 63. 9, or at any rate by his translator in the LXX. It was of course possible to ascribe the deliverance to the Wisdom or Logos of Alexandrine thought, for such figures had no real personality apart from God; and it was at the same time possible to identify them with the actual manifestation of the cloud, and so avoid the awkward consequences of a literal interpretation of Exod. 13. 21.

With the use of the Old Testament *kerygma* as a means of expounding the Gospel the Church had been familiar from the beginning. Paul adopted it as a means of warning the Corinthians against the danger that awaited those who had once been delivered; they were always in peril of relapsing. The fathers were delivered from Egypt; they were sheltered by the cloud and they passed through the Red Sea; the cloud and the sea represented the baptism by which they passed from the complete bondage to sin represented by Egypt into that relative freedom which was represented by Moses and the Torah. They received the spiritual food of the manna and the spiritual drink of the water from the rock; and the rock from which they drank was Christ. The equation of the rock with Christ was simply the equation of Jesus with the Wisdom of God, for which the water from the rock was a standing type in the midrashic exegesis of the synagogues of the Dispersion; Paul slipped into an expression of the thought which occupied his mind, without remembering at the moment that the readers, who had only received milk and not meat, might be unable to follow him in his speculations as to the cosmic position of Jesus as equated with the Wisdom of God.

•

Part II

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA: THE MAN AND HIS EXPERIENCE

[WHO WAS THIS PAUL?]

Hans Lietzmann

HE WAS BORN in Tarsus as the son of a Benjaminite Jew who was distinguished by possessing Roman citizenship. We have no information how the father obtained this standing; he may have been the freedman of an eminent Roman, or, acting as a freedman, he may have earned the interest of the Romans, and have received the honour of citizenship as a gift. A tradition preserved by Jerome says that his parents belonged originally to Gishala in Northern Galilee, and removed to Tarsus in consequence of warlike disturbances. This tradition is not improbable since Paul on one occasion describes himself as a "Hebrew," i.e. probably as a man of Palestine. In any case, one may conclude that the boy grew up in a well-to-do household. Besides his Hebrew name Saul, he bore the eminent Roman cognomen Paul; it must remain undecided whether this name was chosen because of its similarity of sound or in memory of a former patron of the family.

It is certain that the young Paul received a good education and learned some handicraft in addition to the teachings of the school. He entered into a sort of apprenticeship with a tent-maker. Perhaps even at this stage he had it in mind to follow the calling of a rabbi, which indeed presupposed sources of income from a subsidiary occupation. He appears to have come to Jerusalem at an early age, for, according to Acts, he says he was brought up there and was a pupil of the celebrated rabbi Gamaliel who was an eminent "Tannaite" of the first generation. Paul himself asserts that he was a wholehearted Pharisee unconditionally faithful to the Law, and on this account had hated and persecuted the newly uprising sect of the Christians.

In the Jerusalem church his active share in the killing of Stephen was not forgotten, and, according to Acts, he himself tells how he had travelled to other towns in order to continue there the persecution of the Christians. Thus he was commissioned by the sanhedrin to go to Damascus, scarcely in order to bring the Christians whom he found there, in bonds to Jerusalem—for the sanhedrin were not competent to order this, but in order to encourage the Jews to repel the new danger in the name of the sanhedrin.

On this journey, the hand of God was laid upon him; in broad day the Risen Jesus whom he was persecuting, appeared to him in a blinding light and called him to be His apostle. Thereupon he went into the wilderness

From *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, translated by Bertram Lee Woolf, New York, 1937, pp. 135-47. Used by permission of the publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons.

as behoved a man who had been called of God; the barren steppes of the Arabian kingdom of Nabatea stretched out to the south-east of Damascus. Here he thought out the significance of his experience and at last turned back to Damascus.

There he began preaching Jesus as Messiah to the astonishment of the Christians who were at first dubious, and to the confusion of the Jews who plotted to kill him. The latter gained for their plans an arab sheik who was subordinate to the Nabataean king, Aretas IV, and who officiated in Damascus as the Nabataean "ethnarch." They intended to fall upon him outside the city, and for this reason kept a close watch on the gates. The Christians heard of the plan and lowered Paul by night in a basket over the walls. He escaped unhurt to Jerusalem fully two years after his conversion. This visit was probably in A.D. 35. In the capital he desired particularly to make Peter's acquaintance. After doing so, he remained with him for two weeks. At that time he also saw James but no other apostle, nor did he appear in the church. He must therefore have remained hidden from sight in the greatest secrecy, a feature which is quite comprehensible in the case of a convert in the city where there was still a vivid memory of his work as a persecutor. During this fortnight he had his only opportunity of gaining authentic information about the earthly work and life of Jesus from his most eminent disciple. Hitherto, he can only have heard accidental and much perverted echoes. Perhaps also he had certain memories of his own, belonging to his last period in Jerusalem.

Paul soon left the capital and went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, but did not visit the churches of the Jewish Christians to whom only the rumour of the conversion of their former enemy had penetrated. There now followed thirteen years of missionary work about which we have no further information.

The records of Acts are not clear on this point. They describe details with obvious faithfulness but give us no conception of the whole. In any case, Barnabas sent for Paul from his home town of Tarsus whither he had gone from Jerusalem. On Paul's arrival in Antioch they worked together there for a full year. Accompanied by John Mark, a cousin of Barnabas, the two undertook a missionary journey to Pisidia and Lycaonia. The exact period of this journey cannot be determined, and it is possible that other work was done of which we have received no tradition. The only certain fact is, as Paul emphatically declares in Gal., 1, 17-24, that during all these thirteen years he never visited Jerusalem.

Meantime, a problem had become acute which had already existed in germ in the Hellenistic church at Jerusalem, and which had grown to gigantic proportions on account of the mission to the Gentiles, viz. the question as to the operation of the ritual law in the case of new converts who had formerly been Gentiles. As long as the believers in Christ remained and felt themselves still to be Jews, the taking over of the ritual law offered no problem; a pagan who had been won for Christ entered the circle of disciples by circumcision and by baptism understood in a Christian sense. But when, under the pressure of the new teaching, the operation of the Law

was strongly disputed even amongst Hellenist Jews as is described in Acts, it is not surprising, with the increasing strength of the Hellenistic Gentile mission and apart from the question of circumcision and other ritual observances, that the observances of further prescriptions for cleanliness in regard to foods should be felt unnecessary. The more what was new in Christianity came forward in consciousness, the more did the traditional Judaism necessarily lose insignificance. Regardless of consequences, Paul had drawn this conclusion for practical life and had carried out the "freedom from the Law" in his missionary churches more strictly than in Antioch, the Syrian metropolis. Conflict with the traditionalists at Jerusalem could not be avoided, and it is only astonishing that a dozen years passed before the antitheses compelled an attempt at a solution.

Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem, negotiated with the "pillars" of the primitive church: James, Peter, and John, and secured the recognition of their Gentile mission as free from the Law, i.e. baptized pagans had no need to be circumcised. The primitive church on its side declared that, in the future and as in the past, it would exercise only a mission to the Jews. Financial support of the church at Jerusalem was recognized as a duty for the daughter-churches composed of gentile Christians. This was the only obligation laid upon them.

It was with this clear and happy message that the two leaders of the gentile mission returned to Antioch, but it was soon to become evident that a complete solution had not been reached. Obviously the greater majority of the church at Antioch were gentile Christians, and the standpoint of freedom from the ritual requirements, now recognized even by Jerusalem as fully justified, was dominant to such an extent that even the Jewish Christian minority on occasion dispensed with the food laws, especially when it was a case of eating in common with the other brethren, i.e. of celebrating the Lord's Supper. In this way, a desirable agreement was reached in the Pauline sense, and when Peter appeared in Antioch he adopted the local custom without more ado.

But other people, commissioned by James, appeared in the Syrian capital and they were not so tolerant. They thoroughly disagreed with the view that born Jews might leave the Law in any way out of consideration, and they stirred up the consciences of the Antiochene Jewish Christians. Thereupon, Peter also became doubtful and drew back and even Barnabas, the former travelling companion of Paul's, avoided table-fellowship with the unclean. The consequences now became quite clear: a common celebration of the Lord's Supper by both sections was no longer possible, and two separate communities stood over against each other. It became evident to all eyes that the agreement at Jerusalem had not answered the crucial question of the churches of the diaspora, nor settled which section in mixed churches was to determine the mode of life. Paul had solved this problem implicitly in the gentile Christian sense, but now the representatives of James came and gave the opposite answer in no uncertain voice, in so far as they required the gentile Christians to observe the Jewish food prescriptions in order to make possible table fellowship. Peter and Barnabas rec-

ognized this requirement as justified. Thereupon, Paul rose up in passionate anger on behalf of his contention and attacked Peter in front of the assembled church. But the other side did not give way, and from that time forward Paul took his own path separately from that of Peter and that of Barnabas. Thus there arose a considerable amount of hatred and strife.

How did this dispute at Antioch arise? The possibility is that, soon after the departure of Paul and Barnabas, the "Apostolic Decree" was drawn up in Jerusalem and was made known to the most important churches by means of a circular letter. The text is contained in Acts 15, 23-29, though obviously in an edited form, and Judas and Silas who are mentioned in it as messengers must be the representatives of James mentioned by Paul; and their appearance started the dispute. The decree confirmed the view that the gentile Christians were not required to become Jews in all respects, but to abstain from non-conjugal sexual intercourse in every form, and also to use only *kosher* meat at meals. This and nothing else was meant by the formal language of the prohibition to eat meat that had not been offered to idols, or blood, i.e. meat which had not been drained, or meat which had not been strangled, i.e. not ritually killed. This meant, again, that all meat sold in the market was excluded, and that only a Jewish butcher, or, if he sold nothing to Christians, a Jewish Christian slaughtering could be employed for providing meat. This was by no means an insignificant legal requirement, and it is comprehensible that Paul began passionately to ward off the demand especially when it was broadcast in the churches behind his back. Only at the end of his life in Jerusalem, was any direct official information given to him. Thus he did not allow this requirement, not even at a later date when it brought his Corinthian church into confusion. Undisturbedly, he pushed along the straight road of freedom from the Law.

He now carried his missionary work into the larger world, he alone being the responsible leader compared with whom the most capable companions appeared to be only valuable assistants. His sphere was Asia Minor and Greece—but the old questions continually raised their threatening heads. Wherever he went the "Judaizers" followed. In accordance with the policy of maintaining unity, they explained to the newly converted gentiles the necessity of eating only kosher meat according to the Apostolic Decree, and also, contrary to its letter, but in accordance with the spirit of a genuine Jewish Christianity, the soteriological significance of circumcision. These emissaries were in continual contact with Jerusalem, and they made it seem creditable to the churches that James and the original apostles stood behind them. Moreover the shadow of Peter was continually falling upon the path of Paul. In the end, the latter's relationship with the original apostles was completely destroyed, for, when the agreement reached at Jerusalem was subsequently corrected by the Apostolic Decree with all its consequences, he could not regard it as a breach of covenant. Apparently he must have said as much in Antioch when face to face with Peter, although he says nothing to that effect in his letters. He writes not a single syllable about the Apostolic Decree nor its authors, and, apart from the passage in Galatians, he says just as little about his relationship to the original

apostles. He could not dispute their authority, nor could he praise their mode of action or their attitude towards himself. Therefore, he combats in principle the effects which proceed from Jerusalem and in the sharpest language rebukes the emissaries who break down his churches. He utters not a single word about those who gave them authority, nothing about James in Jerusalem, nothing about Peter in Corinth and Rome. He acts as if they were not there. But if we look more closely and are able to read between the lines of his letters, we perceive behind the servants of Satan, the false apostles, and the spurious brethren, the shadows of the great figures in Jerusalem. Paul stood alone in the new world of the Christians whom he had converted and he had very dangerous opponents behind his back.

Acts gives us a fairly detailed account of the outer course of Paul's missionary work. There are indeed larger gaps than the text itself lets us suspect, nevertheless, it is of inexpressible value. We learn of a far-reaching campaign, "the second missionary journey," which took him through the middle of Asia Minor, along the Macedonian coast lands, and into the heart of Greece. He was not successful in gaining a foothold in Athens but he founded a church in Corinth. Here he remained for eighteen months when the opposition of the Jews, perhaps in the summer of A.D. 51, compelled him to return to Antioch. In spite of many inner difficulties, the Corinthian church remained faithful and continued unbroken until the present day.

The "third journey," which began soon afterwards, was at first a renewed visitation of the churches in Asia Minor which had been founded on the previous occasion. It ended in Ephesus which Paul had made the headquarters of his missionary work for two complete years. From here he visited Corinth again and finally, when he had to leave Ephesus, he added a journey of inspection throughout the whole of Greece. Soon he came to the conclusion that he had discharged his task in the east and he directed his glance towards Rome and indeed beyond it to Spain.

Already the gospel had penetrated thus far. Without his assistance, a gentile Christian church had arisen in Rome, possibly founded by Antiochene delegates, and the danger arose that this church, like so many others, would be manoeuvred into opposition to Paul. It is not improbable that Peter was the vehicle of this opposition since formerly in Antioch he had had to swallow that sharp correction. He had been in Corinth and had gained adherents who made things difficult for Paul. It seems altogether probable that he had gone thence to Rome and had brought his own views to some effect there. Paul attempted to hinder this from Corinth in so far as he made the Romans acquainted with his entire programme by his powerful letter. He did this in a preliminary fashion because he intended first to deliver in Jerusalem the dutiful offerings of his churches, and then to come himself. But things happened otherwise than he hoped if not otherwise than he feared. It is true that he attempted to overcome the mistrust of the original church at Jerusalem by correct observance of the Law, but unfortunately he was recognized in the temple by certain Jews of Asia Minor, and was at once accused of having brought into the sacred area a non-Jew among his companions. For so doing the penalty was death.

Paul was dragged out of the temple and threatened with death, when the Roman commandant seized and held him in the hope that he had arrested an Egyptian leader of a band, who had been diligently sought for. He must have been astonished to find that the trouble was due to an uproar within Judaism on religious grounds, and moreover that the prisoner was a Roman citizen. The further course of events cannot be clearly seen from the only apparently exact narratives of Acts. In any case, the commandant held him in a sort of protective custody, in order that the Jews should not destroy him, and eventually handed him over to the procurator in Caesarea. Even here no decision was reached; he was neither handed over to the Jewish court, nor set free, nor judged according to Roman law, but kept two years in prison. A decision was only reached when a new procurator appeared in the person of Festus who suggested to him that he should go before the sanhedrin in Jerusalem. Hitherto Paul had always submitted himself as a faithful Jew to the judgment of his own people, and had accepted their verdicts; indeed on five occasions, he had suffered without opposition the punishments decreed by them, but now he refused the suggestion and desired to be sent as a Roman citizen to the imperial assize. Thereupon Festus did his duty and dispatched the accused man to Rome.

Paul arrived there after a long, varied journey, and when he left the ship was greeted by Christian brethren on Italian soil. He then lived in Rome for two years in relative freedom under police supervision, and was able to have unhindered intercourse with the church and to preach. What happened after that we do not know. It is possible that he was set free and was able once more to set out on his journeys and to continue his work. He may have visited Spain and also have seen the east again. This may be a legend, but it is certain that he suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero and was buried on the road to Ostia.

Paul was not the originator of missionary work to the gentiles; even without him Christianity would have extended round the Mediterranean, but he gave the religion of Jesus the form in which it was capable of conquering the world without receiving damage to its own soul. He had never sat at the feet of the Master, but nevertheless was the only one amongst the apostles who really understood Him. Body and soul he was a Jew, but the spirit of the diaspora had extended his horizon. He boldly weighed the meaning of the history of his people by making it issue in the revelation of the world-religion of the heavenly Lord; the history of the world since then has confirmed his judgment.

To appraise the achievements of Paul's life we must take yet another fact into account, viz. as far as we can follow his life he was a sick man. Probably in outward appearance the exact opposite of a handsome figure such as Dürer gave him, he carried a "thorn in the flesh" and "the marks of Christ" in his body.

His work was a daily dying of his body with Jesus and a constant mishandling of his frame in order to be equal to the problems with which his calling faced him. Some have tried to regard him as an epileptic—owing to a once modern whim—but without grounds. However, his nerves were

overstrung, and they plagued him with appearances which brought bitter suffering to him and others. He did not complain about this, but was proud even in weakness to labour for Christ. The Lord Himself had once said to him "Let yourself be content with My grace, for My power is made perfect in weakness." Hence he had experienced his own theology of the cross and knew what it meant to die with Christ.

FORMATIVE INFLUENCES

Benjamin W. Bacon

THE MERE OUTWARD facts of Paul's early life are soon told, because tradition is so meagre. He appears in Acts a young man, but certainly mature enough and high enough in station to be intrusted by the high-priest with very great and responsible authority. Paul himself in his Epistles and the anti-Pauline author of the "Clementine Homilies"—an Ebionite romance, whose elements date back to about A.D. 170—corroborate this view of his rank and importance. He had come to Jerusalem from Tarsus, one of the foremost university centres of the world at the time, and as a free-born Roman citizen. We find later a married sister of his living in Jerusalem. Perhaps Paul went to her home. He became, according to Acts, the pupil of Gamaliel, the most renowned rabbi of the age, celebrated especially for the broad tolerance of his views, which even led him to make use of Greek literature, to the scandal of more conservative teachers. Gamaliel in Acts is correctly represented as leader, if not creator, of the type of Pharisaism which demanded toleration for Christianity, on broad grounds of abstention from what is God's concern. Later tradition in the Clementine writings goes farther and declares him (of course unwarrantably) a secret believer and friend of the Church. The fact that Paul himself declares that at this time he outdid many of his contemporaries as a zealot for the traditions of the Jewish fathers, evincing his zeal in fierce persecution of the Church, is not sufficient warrant for denying the tradition that he was a pupil of Gamaliel. Others besides the young man himself may have had a voice in the selection of his teacher. Indeed, that will be neither the first nor the last time that a pupil has taken narrower views than his master, and acted in violation of his principles. Gamaliel's influence may have affected Paul more in later life than just at the time of the disputes with Stephen. That also would not be unexampled.

Had we any reason to suppose that Saul of Tarsus had ever seen Jesus we must of course reckon it, however brief the contact, among the vital formative influences. Probably he had never seen or heard him. Certainly not to the extent of any personal intercourse. It is the constant reproach of Paul's bitter antagonists that he had no such knowledge. And Paul's answer is never to deny the allegation, but always to fall back upon his *spiritual* apprehension of Christ. When, in defending his apostleship, he makes a claim of having "seen the Lord," the reference turns out to be to the vision on the road to Damascus. The one passage which seems to imply

From *The Story of St. Paul*, Boston, 1904, pp. 13-33. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Houghton Mifflin Company.

something more, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet would we know him so no more," is simply a mistranslation, as the very italics of Authorized and Revised Versions should show. We should render: "Yea, though (as Jews) we have known a Messiah of the fleshly type (what Jesus designates 'savoring the things that be of men'), yet would we know such a Messiah no more." Moreover, with all his bitter regrets of his persecuting career, Paul never reproaches himself with any part in the plots against Jesus himself. The result is clear. Paul had had no personal contact with the Prophet of Nazareth. He may have been absent from Jerusalem at the special period of Jesus' activity, or his student days under Gamaliel may have begun at a later time. God's Son was revealed *in* Paul; not to the eyes of the flesh.

Paul's career as a persecutor began after the first attacks upon the infant Church had ceased. These were of a purely political character. The Sadducees, or priestly nobility and hierocracy, had no motive in the abortive attempt to stop the preaching of Peter and John, save to enforce order and suppress what they regarded as a revival of the insurrectionary messianism of the crucified Galilean. Orthodoxy was no concern of theirs; they were unorthodox themselves, when not rank infidels. As soon as the Nazarene sect appeared to be politically harmless they let it alone.

The persecution which brought Saul of Tarsus to the front had a totally different motive. It sprang from a new fear, perhaps excited by the more radical type of teaching introduced by Stephen and the Hellenists. These Christians of the Greek world presented a type of doctrine which their orthodox Pharisean opponents in the Synagogue declared to be "blasphemy against Moses and against God." They alleged that it destroyed the exclusive sanctity of the Temple and the authority of the Law. In the disputes, which we are particularly told took place "in the Synagogue of the Cilicians," among others, it is almost certain Paul must have had a part. The stoning of Stephen was less a judicial act than an outbreak of mob violence. That Paul's part in this was as prominent as tradition reports is much more doubtful. But one trait of the story sounds almost like an echo from Paul's own remorseful memory, the appeal of Stephen from his unjust earthly judges to One whom he declared he saw standing as Son of man—the heavenly Judge—beside the throne of God. The apostrophe was silenced with stones. But one that had been witness, if not participant, in that scene might well carry Stephen's dying vision in his memory until he too, arrested in midcourse of persecution, should see the Son of man standing as one exalted, in the glory of God.

A glance at the standard histories will enable us to classify the formative influences under two great heads, the Graeco-Roman, or Hellenistic, and the Pharisean. There can be no question that the youthful Saul's supreme pride was in the latter. To him from childhood the one great goal of life had been "the righteousness of the Law." His proudest consciousness was that he was a Hebrew of Hebrews, of the tribe of his great namesake, Saul; as touching religion, a Pharisee of the strictest sect;

as touching zeal, fiercely intolerant of those whom he conceived to blaspheme the Law and the Holy place; as touching the righteousness of the Law, blameless. All this we may conceive to have filled his heart with a fierce disdain as he looked at the temples and shrines and halls of learning of his native city, or gazed upon the statue of Athenodorus, its great Stoic philosopher, the instructor of two Roman emperors, the benefactor of the city whither he had returned to teach in honored old age. The youthful Saul, free-born Roman citizen as he was, can hardly have shared in person the contempt and opprobrium too often visited upon his unpopular race; but we may be sure which way his sympathies were directed, and that every Gentile insult was fully requited. Toward Gentile thought, as later toward Christian, we must conceive Saul's attitude to have been rather that of active hostility than of indifference or ignorance.

Still there was another side. At Jerusalem it was the Hellenist Jew in whose behalf chivalrous feeling would be called forth. As pupil of Gamaliel, if not in his own right, Saul of Tarsus would feel it a duty to show that the Greek learning, of which his native town was one of the foremost representatives, was not altogether despicable, that Stoicism in particular had "a zeal for righteousness," if not "according to knowledge." And, if we may trust the report of Paul's speeches in Acts, Paul had room alongside his Jewish pride of race for a very distinct feeling of patriotism toward Tarsus as "no mean city." He even seems to have had quite a well-developed sense of the dignity that hedged about the man who could defy the petty magistrates of provincial towns with the magic words, "*Civis Romanus sum*."

The more he saw of the bigotry and provincialism of Jerusalem, condemning in its narrow intolerance even the imperfect Greek studies of his great master Gamaliel, the more must his mind have reverted to doctrines which could not but be familiar to him, doctrines of the Stoics of Tarsus. For the Stoic and Cynic philosopher, from Diogenes to Epictetus, was also a street preacher and exhorter of the common man, a zealot for the law that is written on the fleshly tables of the heart, a profound believer in prayer to the One God of heaven and earth, as our ally in the struggle against the weakness of the flesh.

Paul's speech at Athens, if it be a composition of the author of Acts, has at least an extraordinary correspondence with the outline of his missionary preaching given by Paul himself in 1 Thess. i. 10. At least it depends on real knowledge of such preaching. Down to the startling conclusion of verse 31, which introduces Jesus and the resurrection, with the judgment to come, the whole sermon might be from one of the Cynic or Stoic preachers of Paul's native city, not merely the famous quotation from the Hymn, or Prayer, of Cleanthes the Stoic, the noblest religious utterance of heathen antiquity.

But when Paul began to speak of Jesus and the resurrection they stopped him with derision. And certain of the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers who were there expressed their opinion of the speaker in a term which, Ramsay tells us, was as much the Athenian university slang of the period

as the term "Philister" in the Göttingen slang of Heine's day. "Babbler," our versions render it; literally, "seed-picker." Ramsay has beautifully paraphrased the word by the epithet Browning's Karshish applies to himself, "a picker-up of learning's crumbs." Paul was not schooled in Greek learning. He had only "picked it up," as we see from his inaccurate quotation of the Epicurean poet Menander in 1 Cor. xv. 33. Thus the quick-witted Athenians found an easy target for their ridicule. In Athens he won small results, and by his own account determined at Corinth, his next missionary field, to know nothing of philosophy, but only of "Christ and him crucified."

But among the formative influences which went to the make-up of Paul we cannot afford to neglect the environment of his early years. However Paul may have despised and reacted against it in his youth, the Stoic philosophy was in itself a noble and worthy teaching, and one which, as both tradition and his own writings prove, left an indelible impress on his memory. Whether he would or no, Paul went to Jerusalem something more than a Pharisee. He went a Roman citizen and a Hellenist,—a cosmopolitan in both the political and moral significance, saturated with the atmosphere of the noblest Greek learning of the age, imbued with a sense of that passionate craving for righteousness which distinguished its most exalted and spiritual philosophy, conscious also of its deep religious feeling; for where will you find a tenderer, more pathetic expression for the noblest aspirations of heathen antiquity than that which Paul himself applies: "a groping after God, if haply they might feel after him and find him; though he be not far from any one of us. For in him we live and move and have our being."

Of the two great formative influences of Paul's early life, the first and most important is certainly Pharisaism,—Pharisaism of the best and broadest type, that of the young nobleman who "came running and kneeled to Jesus, saying, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" On the earnest but naive longing displayed by it for the righteousness of the Law, to obtain by it eternal life, Jesus had looked with a yearning affection. Of this kind of Pharisaism Paul said before the Sanhedrin at his last visit to Jerusalem that he had never ceased to be a Pharisee. But in Stoicism also, as revealed in that Hymn of Cleanthes which he quotes at Athens, we should not fail to see a more indirect but not less real influence, fitting him unconsciously for his prodigious task.

Gal. i. 15, where Paul applies to himself the language of Jeremiah, "The word of the Lord came unto me saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth from the womb I sanctified thee: I have appointed thee a prophet unto the Gentiles," is a profoundly significant and characteristic expression of Paul's own feeling regarding the formative influences of his early life. God had adapted everything in it to a great purpose of his own, to which Paul himself had been blind. His very birth, with its political immunities, his Greek life and training, his fanatical zeal for Mosaism,—yes, even, we may believe, the

disputations in which he had engaged with the followers of the Nazarene, the testimony against them, in which he was compelled to specify wherein their doctrines blasphemed the Law or the Temple,—all these had been of God's ordering for the unforeseen end. And the forgiving prayers of his victims—think what they must have been to the heart of a Paul! How blind he had been! All those struggles of his to steel his heart in his own way had been a kicking of the ox against the goad. Steadily, surely, he had been driven along the path, until the scales had fallen from his eyes and he knew “whereunto he was called.”

But what was that great thing for which he had, as he says, been “apprehended of God?” The use of the passage from Jeremiah is a suggestion of Paul's conception of its magnitude. The conference in Jerusalem at which, as he tells us, he convinced the pillar Apostles that “God who energized in Peter an apostleship to the circumcision, had wrought in him for an apostleship to the Gentiles,” the conference where he deliberately took for himself and Barnabas as their province nothing less than the entire world outside of the Jewish people, is conclusive evidence of the magnitude of Paul's ideas. The greatness of it is almost incredible; it seemed so to Paul himself; he marveled that God should have taken him, unworthy as he was, for so sublimely great a vocation. Yet nothing can be clearer than the reiterated utterances in which over and over again he shows, directly and indirectly, that nothing less than this could express the divinely ordered meaning of his life. His vocation was the commending of Christianity to the heathen world as a gospel of God absolutely adequate to the great religious needs it was dimly beginning to feel, groping after an Unknown God, crying out of the darkness for a “Saviour-God” to give it moral strength and life.

Was it then that Paul regarded himself as personally able to evangelize the entire Graeco-Roman world?—Surely not. Prodigious as were his labors, surpassing all the Twelve as he did both in persecutions and in fruitful labors, he certainly entertained no such extravagant idea of his own personal abilities. We are indeed amazed to hear him declare in his letter to the Romans that “there remaineth no more room for me in these parts. From Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.” We must beware, too, of imagining that Paul looked forward to long centuries of intellectual and religious development in which the gospel he had preached would gradually win its way to supremacy in Graeco-Roman civilization. Nothing can be clearer than his participation in the universal belief of the Christians of his age that the wind-up of the world was immediately impending. In his earliest letters Paul expects himself to be among those who should be alive and remain at the coming of the Lord to judgment. In the latest he expects rather to depart and be with Christ, leaving others to complete his unfinished task. But in no case has he any idea of the long perspective of growth. The gathering in of the Gentile was to him only the gathering of the few ripe sheaves that might be gleaned in a lifetime. None, surely, can have been more conscious than Paul that his personal work was but the barest scattering of

the seed here and there. In what sense, then, can he have thought of himself as destined for so prodigious a vocation?—Simply in the insight which God had given him into the meaning of all his providence, in the appearance of Jesus risen from the dead, a glorified *world's* Messiah, for whom not only Israel but also the heathen world had all these ages been preparing. The time was indeed to be short, though Rom. ix.–xi. opens a far longer perspective than 2 Thess. But the arch was already built. It needed only the keystone. Heathen religious thought at its best had been God's disciplinary preparation for the Gospel. Paul's revelation would make it complete. He had but to proclaim "the secret," the "mystery long hid but now revealed," which would commend itself to every right-minded Gentile whose heart God had prepared. This would then disseminate itself with the swiftness of a spreading fire.

This is what he calls "the dispensation of the grace of God toward the Gentiles which was given to me:" "how that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery, which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, how that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the Gospel, whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of that grace of God which was given me according to the working of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery, which from all ages hath been hid in God, who created all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

All the experiences of Paul's life up to the time of his conversion had to his mind been unconsciously leading up to this. God had made known to him a "mystery" hidden from times eternal. But once proclaimed it could be hid no longer. *Christianity makes of Judaism the world-religion.* That was the heart of it. I hope to show as we engage in the study of the Pauline Epistles how truly and in what sense Paul's conception of Christianity made it a response to the need of the whole world, the capstone of a double arch whose buttress on the one side was planted on Jewish, on the other on Gentile soil. In conclusion . . . let me only try to illustrate the view which Paul may have taken of his divine calling as the Apostle to the Gentiles, by the career of his great predecessor, Philo the Jewish philosopher of Alexandria. Philo's works may or may not have been known to Paul, but they have survived to our time just because they embody to such an extent ideas which to us seem altogether Christian. Mediaeval ecclesiastics and scribes, ignorant of the fact that they were written before the preaching of Jesus, classified and transcribed them for this reason among the works of the Christian Fathers.

For centuries even in Philo's day the Greek-speaking world had been morally and religiously approaching a type of thought closely similar to that of the Hebrew prophets. The old polytheism was no longer anything

more than a rapidly crumbling superstition of the ignorant rabble. Not philosophers only, but all intelligent and earnest-minded people revered the One supreme divinity, the δ θεός of Plato. What the Stoic and Cynic philosophers were busy with Hausrath has told in his chapters on their propaganda. In Alexandria the mythologic tales of Homer and Hesiod were rejected as fables, or interpreted allegorically, so as to remove what was incompatible with the conception of a supreme God, wise and just and holy. What wonder that in this seat of Jewish progressive thought and Greek learning Jews should lay hold of Greek philosophy to claim it as an off-shoot of Mosaism? And not only Greek but Egyptian and Oriental thought had been laid under contribution.

Philo is the greatest representative of this effort. To him the great ideas of Plato are mere sparks from the divine revelation vouchsafed to Moses. In the Law and the Prophets he discovers the whole Platonic philosophy by means of allegorical interpretation; and this system, half Jewish, half Greek, he launches on the stream of Alexandrian thought, convinced that it meets the world's need, embodying the sun and substance of philosophy and religion.

To us it seems a mere hybrid, which appeals neither with the force of Platonism nor of Mosaism. But certainly the conception was a magnificent one, and worthy of the age which had seen the world made politically one. To conceive Judaism enriched with all of Greek philosophic thought, expanding from the mere religion of a petty nation into a world-religion, and this before the preaching of the Gospel, was no mean ideal.

Our fourth evangelist employs the phraseology of Philo for his great doctrine of the *Logos*. Philo himself borrows the term from the Ionic philosophers to signify the supreme link between the Creator and his world, God and man. "John" is but the systematizer of Paul in his feeling that this Logos-doctrine needs but the knowledge of Jesus as Messiah to make it complete. "The Logos became flesh and dwelt among us." With these words he adopts the highest thought of Philo and, giving it Christian baptism, transmits it to the Church as the philosophic expression of the Pauline Christology. For "John" is but the "vindicator"—the *goël*—of Paul, the true "Apostle of love," whose Logos-doctrine, as Sabatier has said, lacks but the name to be Johannine; just as Sanday, conversely, has designated the Johannine as Pauline in all but the name.

We must not think of Paul as directly dependent on any Stoic writer, any more than the fourth evangelist is directly dependent on Philo. We do know, however, that Paul was profoundly influenced by the book called the Wisdom of Solomon, which presents some of the most characteristic Stoic ideas in Pharisean garb, and we have at least some reason to think he was not wholly unaffected by the teaching of Gamaliel. At any rate, that which Philo's philosophic system, grandly conceived as it was, could not do in that it remained, in the absence of any knowledge of the actual historic Christ, a bare abstract speculation, that Paul did, uniting the highest thought of Hebrew prophet and Greek philosopher in a gospel which

for Jew and Greek is forever "Christ, the Power of God and the Wisdom of God."

Our best attainable explanation of Paul's sense of his vocation, so unmistakable and at the same time so almost incredibly great, will be found in his own sense of the working of God in the formative influences of his life. For therein Paul realized that God had "revealed His Son in him," as the common goal of Gentile groping after God, and Jewish striving for righteousness, the Wisdom and the Power of God.

THE SOURCES OF PAULINE MYSTICISM

Chester C. McCown

HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED, Pauline mysticism has been extremely influential. Paul's mystical experiences were to him the very essence of his religion. Wherever so-called "Paulinism" prevails, and in the extent to which it prevails, experiences similar to Paul's are regarded as the only marks of a true Christian, and his interpretations of them are the basis of the only acceptable theology; all else is heterodoxy. Since Paul's experiences had a peculiarly vivid and unmistakable character, and his explanatory language was unusually colorful and suggestive, yet widely connotative rather than narrowly denotative, analogical rather than analytical, emotive rather than logical, he who pleaded hardest for Christian unity in the one body of Christ has been one of the chief sources of Christian disunity. The distinction, therefore, between his actual emotional experiences and the language in which he describes and interprets them is of prime importance, and a careful appraisal of his language is indispensable.

ROLE OF SOCIAL PATTERNS

The general ideas and categories by which experience is classified are inevitably derived from the culture of the society to which a person belongs. He must speak approximately the language of his fellows if they are to understand him and accept his leadership. The meaning of the patterns of thought and of the words which any person uses is approximately that of the social groups in which he moves and can be known by the discovery of their immediate sources. . . . What has been said implies only that the meaning of Paul's language depends upon the culture to which he belongs. That is precisely the issue. Was he a Palestinian or a Diaspora Jew? Was ancient Hebrew culture as reinterpreted by rabbinism the chief ingredient in his thinking, or did he belong to the Hellenistic world? The essence of the problem, therefore, is a matter of cultural history. The special purpose of this essay is to analyze the problem in the light of cultural anthropology or cultural history, and, on this basis, to evaluate the various types of argument which have been put forward.

Anthropological, or, more precisely, ethnological method is invoked because recent studies in that field have dealt with problems of methodology in the area of cultural history with conspicuous clarity. Because of the

From *Munera Studiosa*, edited by Massey H. Shepherd and Sherman E. Johnson, Cambridge, Mass., 1946, pp. 51-67. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Episcopal Theological School, and the author.

attraction of "human interest," history long contended itself with actions of individuals. Because the individuals chiefly in the public eye and, therefore, of immediate "topical" interest were rulers and warriors, history was largely political and military. In religious history, particularly of New Testament times, the outstanding individuals, their activities, and their ideas, along with questions of organization and ritual, have too often monopolized attention. They have been studied *in vacuo*. The first step toward an accurate perspective, taken by Montesquieu and Voltaire, was the enlargement of history to include the culture of the society to which the individuals belonged. The growth of attention to milieu marks the gradual development of a sociological point of view, which includes all classes of society and all features of human activity and thought, that is, the total stream of human experience, as the field of historical research.

Unfortunately, cultural studies have too often been regarded merely as a backdrop for history. Actually, the only history that has scientific and normative value is cultural history. What the historian has called "continuity," and the ethnologist "functionalism," is an attempt to correct the individualist and episodic conception of history by discovering intercultural bonds and tracing cultural development. Individuals, books, institutions, movements cannot be understood by themselves. Each is a function of the whole. History is a seamless garment. It represents both a time and a space continuum. Not only is history a process in time, evolutionary in its nature, but each event, in its measure, conditions every other contemporary as well as succeeding event, as the smallest asteroid affects the largest sun. The extent of gravitational effect is, in general, dependent on distance and mass. In cultural history much more subtle and complicated measurements are involved. The present task is to consider their nature and the necessary techniques in a particular case.

A study such as this has three main aspects: (1) the problem of method in intercultural studies as just outlined; (2) the question as to the nature of the New Testament documents and of the other sources, documentary and archaeological, available for the understanding of Paul's cultural situation, and (3) a comparison of the New Testament evidence regarding Paul with evidence regarding contemporary mysticism. Prejudice aside, the differences of opinion which prevail are due chiefly to differences of procedure, or method, in all of these areas.

INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

No problem of intercultural relationships can be stated without at once raising the question of "borrowing," a word which has a pejorative connotation. More precisely expressed, it is a question of "diffusion *vs.* parallelism," a subject which recalls a long and unedifying quarrel among anthropologists and students of religions. One theory is that mankind was, and is, naturally inventive, and that, under fairly similar circumstances, the psychic unity of the race produces the discovery of similar ideas and techniques in widely separated regions of the world. The contrary theory is that man is uninventive and that the basic ideas and techniques which

make culture have been discovered once for all by specially gifted individuals under favorable circumstances (or have been divinely revealed), and have then spread over all the world.

A. L. Kroeber has recently given to a peculiarly original type of adaptation the name of "stimulus diffusion," or "idea diffusion." A system, or pattern, is usually taken over with certain items of its content. In "stimulus diffusion" the content is entirely rejected; only the system, or idea, is adopted. One of the best and most familiar examples is the adaptation of Egyptian hieroglyphics to the Hebrew-Phoenician alphabet. The scheme of reducing spoken speech to signs was given an entirely new and epoch-making usefulness when it was applied, not to the representation of ideas or syllables, but, by a new and abstract analysis, to the component parts of syllables. The concept of stimulus diffusion seems particularly applicable to the early Christian and Pauline use of Hellenistic religions.

The pertinence of these conclusions to the problem of Pauline mysticism is evident. It is a matter of intercultural relations. More fully stated the question at issue is how the clash of Jewish and Hellenistic cultures affected the development of Christianity. It began as a thoroughly Jewish messianic movement based upon Old Testament prophecy and Jewish apocalyptic eschatology. Its central feature was the hope of a social transformation which was to be wrought by the miraculous intervention of God and which should establish on earth economic justice, class equality, and individual righteousness, with resulting universal well being and happiness. Oppressors were to be overthrown, the oppressed set free, and social derelicts saved. All evil was to come to an end. Within two or three generations this Jewish movement concerned with righteousness and justice in the present world had been transformed into a universalistic, mystical, semimagical, otherworldly cult of a heavenly Kyrios. Chiefly by means of its cultic rites according to popular belief, the new religion sought individual salvation from sin and eventual immortality and was largely alien to its original social intention and interest. Whether "the powers that be" were hostile to God or ordained by Him, social righteousness in this world was not important. Salvation lay finally only in another world. The immediate question as to the part Paul played in this transformation can be answered only by discovering the meaning of his language, and that is to be found by determining the sources of the terms he used to describe his experience and his application of them. Was he using the language and ideas of a Palestinian rabbi or of a Jew of the Hellenistic Dispersion?

CONTEMPORARY EVIDENCE

The answers to these questions are to be found in contemporary documents, the New Testament and the literary and nonliterary remains as well as the archaeological materials regarding popular religious beliefs, Jewish and Hellenistic, and especially regarding the mystery cults of the first century. As to the New Testament, it should hardly be necessary

to state that the only trustworthy source of information regarding Paul is to be found in Paul's own letters. This is not the place in which to discuss the historical value of the Book of Acts. Great as that value is, it must be remembered that Paul's letters are primary sources, the Book of Acts definitely secondary as regards the first generation of Christians, including Paul himself. Moreover, practically every statement in Acts emphasizing Paul's Jewishness is in the fictional "Thucydidean" speeches of Acts and, therefore, is doubly under suspicion. The irenic and apologetic motifs in Acts easily account for the author's assumptions that there was little difference between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. Paul's own letters, on the contrary, even in the passages which emphasize his Jewishness, where references to Gamaliel and an education at Jerusalem might be expected, make no such claims. Actually they are quite ambiguous, except as to his ancestry.

Paul did, indeed, claim to have been a strict Pharisee. What his standards of observance were we cannot know. His claims are general, without definite content. Even so, it is perfectly clear that it was against the Pharisaic conception of salvation by observing the Law that he bitterly rebelled. For Paul salvation from the Law, that is from Judaism, was as important as salvation from sin. He insisted, moreover, that his new faith was the true Judaism. With a shout of relief he exclaims that he had abandoned all his Jewishness and thrown it away as offal in order that he might be a true Christian. The question as to what he threw away and what he retained can be answered only from what Paul reveals as to his Christian beliefs.

The authentic Jewish element in Paul must neither be minimized nor magnified. It is comparatively easy for the Christian scholar to discover it, perhaps too easy, for appearances in this matter are frequently deceptive. Paul often argues like a rabbi. But allegory and strained interpretations had been applied to Homer, Hesiod, and Greek mythology in general long before Hellenistic times. Such methods of evasion were especially prized by the Stoics. They were widely used by Jews of the Diaspora, notoriously by Philo. Paul's most distinctive Jewish trait was his eschatology, which, before him, had been adapted from Magianism and which he in part assimilated to Hellenistic ideas of immortality. His ethics and his theology are not un-Jewish, but, in many points, they have marked affinities with Stoicism, as have his methods of exegesis. Stoicism and Judaism often agreed.

The decisive evidence as to Paul's cultural atmosphere is to be found, not in what he thought he was and claimed to be, but in what his own words unconsciously reveal him to have been. The year 1943 saw the publication of two works by competent scholars who emphatically claim Paul to have been, not the true Pharisaic Hebrew he evidently thought himself to be (2 Cor. 11:22; Phil. 3:4 ff.), but a thoroughly Hellenized Diaspora Jew. When two scholars so radically different in their critical and religious presuppositions as Charles Guignebert and Joseph Klausner agree that Paul's Christianity was thoroughly un-Jewish and diverged sharply from the religion of Jesus, the significance of their thesis cannot

be lightly overlooked. The opinion of a highly competent Jewish scholar, like Rabbi Klausner, as to the Jewishness of Paul, carries especial weight.

It is Paul's faith-mysticism, his conception, not of God's character, but of the Christian's relation to God, in which he departs most radically from Palestinian Judaism and approaches views found in Philo, approaches only to pass far beyond in the direction of Hermetism and the later pagan mysticism of Plotinus and Porphyry. Could this element be derived from the Old Testament, the later apocalyptic and apocryphal Jewish literature, or rabbinic teaching as illustrated in the Talmud, or is it to be explained as due to Hellenistic influence?

THE HELLENISTIC MYSTERY RELIGIONS

To determine the extent and meaning of the non-Jewish element in Paul's thought, his language must be compared with that of the mystery religions. The possibility that he was thoroughly familiar with the chief ideas of the Hellenistic religions cannot be questioned. It may be admitted that the most important documents which treat them with some fullness come from the second century or later. Apuleius' *Golden Ass*, with its instructive accounts of Isiac initiations, Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris*, the majority of the Mithraic monuments, the Poimandres and Hermetic literature, all belong after Paul's time. It may be granted that before the Christian era detailed information regarding the mystery religions, especially those of oriental origin, is wanting. Indeed, we know too little from any period. But the ancient and widespread cult of Dionysus, the mysteries of Samothrace and Eleusis, with the Orphic interpretations of their rites, antedate Christianity by many centuries. Adonis, Attis and Magna Mater, Osiris and Isis, and Mithra himself are attested as deities worshipped with mystery rites long before Paul was born. The absence of fuller literary evidence proves nothing. Allusions are enough. The modern student, accustomed to learning solely from books, is prone to assume that, in ancient times as in modern, new ideas were propagated in writing. When a few copies of any document were laboriously made by hand and read only by a minute minority of the population, a new faith was necessarily propagated by word of mouth. Preaching came first with other missionaries besides Paul and his collaborators. The gospel was before the Gospels. Later written documents appeared in order that converts might know the certainty of the things in which they had been instructed (Lk. 1:1). First the spoken, then the written, word was the natural order. The mystery cults, since they were secret, would have been all the more chary of written documents. As they were eventually defeated and destroyed by victorious Christianity, they suffered the fate of the vanquished, oblivion. Their few records were neglected when not intentionally destroyed. Absence of numerous contemporary documents is immaterial. If it were decisive, the existence of Christianity in the first century would be in doubt.

Asia Minor, where Paul was born, and where Christianity enjoyed its first large successes, was especially notable as the home of synthetic cults as well as mystery religions. They could not have been unknown at Tarsus,

a seaport lying at the opening of the Cilician Gates, the great pathway from Orient to Occident. Long before Paul was born the Cilician pirates worshiped Mithra, who may already have been a mystery deity. Sandan, the chief god of Tarsus, was a vegetation deity who, apparently, died, went to heaven and was restored to life each year, and who, therefore, was at least an apt candidate for a mystery cult.

Not all Jews were deeply impregnated with pagan elements, but Hellenistic Jewish literature gives significant evidence as to the effect of constant contacts with foreign culture upon men who believed themselves true Jews. The Wisdom of Solomon and Philo's works are only the best known of a large number, many preserved only by title. Paul certainly knew the former. He may have heard the name of Philo; hardly more. Yet Philo and similar Jewish apologists for their faith go far to make clear the kind of influences which were constantly at work upon Jews of the Hellenistic Dispersion. In all probability the influence of such works, many now long ago lost, as well as direct contact with Hellenistic ideas that were current in the workshop and the market place, were responsible for a conditioning of Paul's mind and spirit of which he was quite unconscious. If he persecuted Hellenistic Jewish Christians in Damascus and elsewhere, their defenses of their faith would have worked upon him the more effectively because of his resistance to their arguments. Paul was not the only or the first converted Diaspora Jew. Quite the contrary. In many ways he reaped where he had not sowed. In spite of himself he built on others' foundations.

Wherever Paul's restless urge to evangelize the heathen took him he would have come upon votaries of the mystery cults, either Greek or Oriental. Adonis was famous in Syria. Anatolia, where Paul traveled more widely, spent more time, and wrote more letters than anywhere else, so far as the records of Acts go, was especially the home of syncretistic Jewish cults, such as that of Sabazios. Phrygia was noted for its cults (and became the first great stronghold of Christianity). At Ephesus Paul must have observed the numerous Magna Mater shrines that still may be seen, as well as the famous Artemision. He is said to have passed through Samothrace (Acts 16:11). In Philippi and Thessalonika could he have failed to hear of the Dionysiac orgies of the women of Macedonia? At Athens and Corinth he could hardly have argued regarding the resurrection without hearing of Eleusis and Persephone. Everywhere he would learn of mysteries taught only the "perfect," or "mature," that is to "initiates" (*teleioi*). In the middle of the first centuries, in any of the cities which Paul visited, it is impossible that the mass of the inhabitants, whether themselves initiates or not, should have been ignorant of what the mystery religions promised. It is equally impossible that a person so keen of perception and appreciative of current thinking as Paul's letters show him to have been, a man who prided himself on being all things to all men, should have ignored this competition and the positive religious values of the competing religions. Men everywhere were seeking and being promised salvation from evil and escape from an evil world into a happy immortality through fellowship with deities who had overcome evil and death by

themselves dying and rising again. He could not fail to respond to such needs.

PAUL'S USE OF MYSTERY LANGUAGE

When Paul's cultural relations are considered, it is not at all strange that his letter to the Colossians (1:26 f., 2:2) should speak of the long-hidden "mystery which is Christ in you, the hope of glory," of the "recognition of the mystery of God, Christ, in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (*sophia* and *gnosis*), and should warn most vehemently against what are apparently theosophic, gnostic, and ascetic cults of elemental spirits and angels. The word "mystery" appears again and again in Paul's letters, usually in connection with the idea of the revelation of divine wisdom and with that of the indwelling Christ, or the Spirit. Paul's hearers and readers could hardly have missed, what must also have been in his own mind, the overtones of reference to the revelations in initiations into the mystery religions, or perchance to the ideas of Hermetism.

In Paul's scattered and unsystematized interpretations and expositions of his faith in Christ, what he offers is a series of attempts to make Christianity intelligible and attractive to people who were fully acquainted with the promises of salvation through union with a deity in a mystery cult. He uses illustration after illustration, drawn sometimes from life, but more often from the language of the cults, to prove that faith in Christ guaranteed all that any mystery cult could promise, and very much more. Jesus Christ had died and risen again; he was a heavenly *Kyrios*, like the "lords" of the mystery cults, and like them a *Soter*, a "savior." The Christian was "baptized into his death, . . . grown together (*symphytos*) with him in the likeness of his death, but also of his resurrection" (Rom. 6:3 ff.). Even more significant is the famous saying, "I am crucified with Christ, and I no longer live, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:19 f.).

This is neither Judaism nor the religion of the synoptic Gospel nor that of Jesus. On the other hand, it is anything but pure mystery-cult doctrine. Paul is confident that his mystical relationship with Christ guarantees his future resurrection (Rom. 8:11); the gift of the Spirit is an *arrabon*, a "pledge," of eternal life (2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5). But quite in contrast to anything that we know of the mystery religions, the divine life imparted to the soul meant a new moral life (Rom. 6:4-15; 8:12 f.). The passage often quoted to prove Paul a sacramentarian (1 Cor. 11:27-30) demonstrates just the opposite. The eucharist is a sacred thing. But it does not save *ex opere operato*; just the contrary. God will punish him who partakes unworthily. Both faith-mysticism and morality enter into the operation.

This is perhaps sufficient to illustrate the attitudes and methods which promise most for an understanding of Paul's part in the development of Christian thought. He is to be seen as the child of two conflicting heritages: the practical, activist, this-worldly, ethical, legalistic, nonspeculative attitudes of Judaism, on the one hand, and, on the other, the imaginative, speculative, ascetic, at times amoral, mystical tendencies of Hellenism. He combined the

two in an unstable compound which was very different from the religion of Jesus and equally different from any of the mystery religions or ethical philosophies of Hellenism. As Guignebert has forcibly expressed it, the Diaspora Jew, Paul, torn between the warring Jewish and Hellenistic elements which his mixed social origin had implanted in him, found in Christianity regarded as a doctrine of salvation "the harmonization of his unconscious aspirations as an Asiatic and his hopes as a Jew."

Paul's descriptions of his Christian faith are the attempts of a peculiarly gifted and receptive spirit to put, into understandable language and familiar, contemporary thought forms, ideas which would satisfy the religious needs of his fellow seekers after salvation as he felt them in himself and observed them in others. The result is a social product, the product of the impact of Hellenistic culture upon Jewish-Persian culture and upon generations of Diaspora Jews before Jesus and Paul were born. Paul's religious faith is not an autonomous, independent development. His mysticism is neither a "parallel development" to Hellenistic mysticism, nor a borrowed idea, taken over unchanged, but the result of "stimulus diffusion": i.e., it is Jewish trust in Yahweh and Jewish belief in divine inspiration as illustrated in the prophets expressed in the framework, the thought categories and the language, of the mystery religions. Prophetic ethical monotheism is presented within the social pattern of pagan mysticism.

Paul was clearly "borrowing" from the religions of his environment. But what was borrowed was immediately put out at high interest, or, to use another figure, the seed fell into fertile soil and bore fruit a hundred-fold. It is a clear case of "stimulus diffusion," in which a new content, related but different, was put into another system. It was a departure on a long journey, from the social "good tidings of God's reign" to the individualistic hope of salvation from sin and an evil world to eternal life in heaven. But it met the needs of a great population which lived under very different cultural conditions and had very different religious desires from those of Jesus' hearers. Without the transformation which Christianity suffered at the hands of Paul Christianity could hardly have survived in the Roman Empire.

DID PAUL SEE JESUS?

William M. Ramsay

ONE OF THE most fundamental questions in regard to the point of view from which Paul regarded the Saviour is whether Jesus in life had been a complete stranger to him or had been personally known to him. The article by Professor J. H. Moulton in the *Expositor* for July, 1911, p. 16, therefore, profoundly interested me; and still more Professor Johannes Weiss's *Paul and Jesus*, which I immediately procured on Professor Moulton's recommendation. In the *Expositor*, May, 1901, p. 362, I published an article stating reasons for the same view, that Paul knew Jesus in the vision on the road near Damascus, because he had seen Jesus in life and recognised the man whom he had known. When Professor Weiss on p. 40 expresses his "wonder how the whole school of modern theology has been able so readily to reject the best and most natural explanation of these difficulties, namely, the assumption that Paul had seen Jesus personally, and that the sight had made an indelible impression on him," he may perhaps be interested to learn that one who looks at this subject solely as an historian, and who has no pretension to be a theologian, took his view.

It must have been about the year 1901 that I ventured to express the same opinion in an address at Sion College; and, in the discussion which followed, the Rev. Mr. Relton (as I think) expressed the opinion that I must inevitably regard the words of Second Corinthians v. 16 in very much the same way as Professor Weiss does in his book, pp. 42-53. I had not myself observed the bearing of this passage from Second Corinthians; nor should I have been able to argue so subtly and skilfully as Professor Weiss has done for his interpretation; but, since Mr. Relton drew my attention to the passage, I have regarded it as a possible, but far from the most convincing, argument on this side.

More than ten years have passed since that article was printed; and the more I have thought over the subject, the more has its importance been impressed on me. Often I have had to speak on the subject; and as time passed the clearer grew in my thought a certain picture and vision of the Apostle. With much that appears in Weiss, I gladly find myself in perfect agreement. As he says (p. 29) that near Damascus "the figure of the Messiah, whose coming from Heaven was the object of such deep desires and prayers, might appear to the Apostle; he was profoundly moved by these longings. . . . But . . . by what signs did Paul recognise the figure as Jesus?" Peter and others recognised Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.): Paul also

From *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, London, 1913, pp. 21-30. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Hodder and Stoughton.

recognised Him. In both cases they recognised Him because they had seen Him. I can only quote the words of Weiss (p. 31): "Paul's vision and conversion are psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the human personality of Jesus."

Paul describes himself as a witness that Jesus was living quite in the same way in which he describes Peter and the rest as witnesses. They were witnesses, because they knew the man whom they had seen. Paul would not offer his evidence as in the same category with theirs, if he merely believed what he was told. He believed, because he recognised the man whom he had seen in life.

For this recognition it is necessary that the event should have occurred not too long after the death of Jesus. Recognition would be most effectual and would weigh most with others, in the case of a person who had not been very long dead. When Paul classes himself as a witness with Peter and the rest, he does not mean that they recognised Jesus within a few days or weeks of His death, while he recognised Jesus after eight years (as would be the case according to the chronological theory—hopelessly wrong, in my opinion, on other grounds—that the Crucifixion occurred in A.D. 29, and the Vision of Saul after A.D. 37). This consideration furnishes a subsidiary, though not in itself an absolutely conclusive argument, against that chronological theory.

The point of view which has been taken in the preceding paragraphs is after all external, though, as put by Professor Weiss, it is very strong. To my own mind the most conclusive reason lies in its bearing on the development of Saul's mind and thought. In this respect I find myself in diametrical opposition to the Heidelberg theologian. To him Paul's Conversion was the outward and final culmination of a long and slow inward process. He says on p. 35 (referring to the view which he quotes from Kölbing), that Paul "possessed a very close and clear knowledge of the person and work of Jesus; it would almost appear that Paul before his conversion had read that Gospel of Mark from which Kölbing takes the essential features of his picture of Jesus." Weiss then proceeds: "At any rate, the main idea is undoubtedly correct . . . he must already have been half-persuaded, and have plunged into the task of persecution with forced zeal and an uneasy conscience." On p. 36 he proceeds: "It is certainly correct to assume that the faith of the first disciples also influenced Paul"; and on p. 37, "we may therefore adhere to the opinion that the 'Spirit of Jesus,' working through His disciples, eventually conquered Paul: the figure of Jesus was so convincingly apparent through the lives and characters of His adherents that Paul's powers of resistance eventually grew wearied, and mentally he was prepared for the ultimate change that he himself realised."

With this picture of the process in Paul's mind, I regret to find myself in absolute disagreement. One may pass over what is, in my opinion, the hopeless incongruity that a man like Paul, in order to still an uneasy conscience and to force himself to resist the conviction which was gradually

growing in his mind, "plunged into the task of persecution" and of murder. Had Saul felt a moment's doubt he must have satisfied himself before he slew his neighbours and outran all his contemporaries in cruelty and desire to imprison, and even to kill, those about whom a suspicion was growing in his mind that they might after all be right. This psychological impossibility might be insisted on at more length, but we pass over it, and we rest our case on the statement of Paul himself, corroborated by Luke, but quite independent of Luke's evidence.

In the first place, Paul lays the strongest emphasis on the fact that his change of mind and life was wholly independent of the other Apostles. He came to his new career through a sudden and direct relation between Christ and himself. He stood over-against God, and he was struck down by God and grasped by Jesus. If we give up that, what are we to accept from Paul about his own past life? We are plunged in a sea of uncertainties; some things we accept and some we reject in his testimony. We accept or reject in virtue of some prepossession or psychological theory, and not in virtue of Paul's own statements.

In the second place, Paul states in the strongest way that he was in the full course of unhesitating and fanatical persecution. He had no doubt. He hated that impostor, and he was resolved to exterminate all that were deluded by Him, and to trample out the embers of the dying fire. There was in the mind of Paul, according to his own emphatic words, no preparation for the great change in his life, no process of gradually assimilating this teaching. He had, once for all, been convinced by that shameful death on the cross, that the man Jesus was an impostor who had degraded and brought into contempt the most sacred belief of the Jews, the belief in a coming Messiah and in an elevation of the whole race once more to its rightful position in the world.

Now take into account Paul's nature and his acquired character. He was fully possessed by all the Jewish obstinate and fervent belief in what he considered right. He hated the Man that had parodied the Messianic idea and shamed the chosen people. What process of reasoning would have convinced such a man? What argument would have weighed with him? He was blind and deaf to all human evidence. One witness, or fifty, or five thousand, would have weighed equally with him; and their weight would have been nought. Their evidence was all delusion, all untrustworthy. They had some virtues, for they were, after all, Jews; but they were destroying the hope of Israel by their perverted delusion. That Israel might live, they must die, so far as the Roman law allowed; in Damascus, governed by a foreign king, there was more hope of massacre than there was under Roman law in Judaea, and there for some reason the Christians had taken refuge in considerable numbers. To Damascus, therefore, Paul went.

Human reasoning and testimony could have had no effect on Paul, as he describes his own condition. He was suddenly convinced: Christ seized him: the power of God irradiated him. He recognised as living in the Divine

glory the man whom he had believed to be a dead impostor. He knew the man by sight. He heard His voice and His words.

I assume here, because this is not the place to discuss it more fully, that there are occasions when one man can hear what another cannot hear, and when one man can see what another cannot see. That Paul knew to be true. He had felt it; he had seen and he had heard. On this the rest of his life was built. You cannot get away from this. So he says; and on this belief he founded his career, and conquered the world.

I believe, and know from experience, that the thought of one mind may, in certain circumstances, be heard by another. No one can take from me what I know to be true; although, as a whole, the circumstances and comforts of modern life alike in Britain and in Germany are unfavorable to the development of that sensibility. Yet the power exists potentially in most people, though often weakened and deadened by the fortunes of life; and it can and does become active in a few.

The view that seems to emerge from the long discussion of the subject is the same view that Paul himself states, and Luke and others believed. Saul, with his perfect confidence in the truth and righteousness of his own opinions—a kind of belief such as may be found among young men, trained by great masters and leaders, venerating their teachers, intensely desirous of knowing the truth, enthusiastic to the highest degree, zealous for the right as they conceive it, and strenuously bent on living the Divine life and spending themselves in their career of duty—was wholly impervious to reason and to evidence. He knew far better than these followers of Jesus.

Some other way than mere word was needed to move him. He had to be convinced that Jesus, whom he had thought a dead impostor, was a living God. He saw the man, and recognised Him. He would believe no other person; he believed his own senses and his own knowledge. Nothing except himself would convince him. He was a witness that Jesus was living. As he says: "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" He ranked himself as a personal witness to the truth on which his future career rested; and this change of mind and life came on him suddenly like a flash of lightning. There was no preparation for the change. Paul was one of those who learn the greatest things by intuition, as in a flash of inspiration.

There was a motive cause, sudden and overwhelming. This cause was that he saw alive and recognised the man whom he had believed to be dead.

The permanent effect on Paul was most striking in respect of one detail. The cross, which had hitherto been the "stumbling-block" in his way, which he regarded as typical of the triumph of Rome over his own race, the Chosen People, and as the visible expression of the disgrace and shame inflicted on Israel by its conquerors, that cross he henceforth regarded as typical of the triumph of Jesus over Rome, and as symbolical of the powerlessness of the mighty Roman Empire to touch the man whom it had condemned and tried to kill. but tried in vain. In His Crucifixion, Jesus celebrated a triumph over all His enemies: He nailed to the cross the condemnatory document: He leads in the long train of His triumph (as the Roman general led through the Roman streets) His conquering

soldiers who trust in Him (Col. ii. 15; 2 Cor. ii. 14). Paul henceforth gloried in this symbol of victory and Divine power more than in anything else. He learned by eyesight, as well as in other ways, what the cross really meant.

In 1 Corinthians ix. 1 and xv. 8 Paul emphasizes specially that he had seen Jesus. This is the point on which he lays great stress. He is comparing himself with the Apostles. He saw Jesus as they saw Him. He is an eye-witness as they were.

The evidence of the Acts seems at first sight somewhat different. To those who are ready to accept the evidence of the Acts when it suits them, and to throw it overboard whenever they dislike it, the statements on this subject contained in that book will matter little; they take just what they want, and leave the rest. But to those who treat the Acts seriously and rationally as a historical work from which the modern critic is not free to pick what he likes and throw aside what he likes, but which he has to judge as a whole, the case is different. Why does Luke in his three accounts mention only once (Acts xxvi. 13-20) that Jesus appeared to the eyes of Saul? Here Paul relates that as he rose and stood on his feet before Jesus, detailed instructions were given him as to what he should do: part of his work was to bear witness of what he saw.

Yet, although this detail is not explicitly stated in the other two accounts which Luke gives of the scene, yet in both it is implied that Paul saw Jesus at that time, Luke's space was narrow and his accounts are brief; but he implies much that he does not expressly record.

In the first account given in the Acts ix. 4-8 Luke mentions that the men who were with him "stood speechless, hearing the voice but beholding no man." We are to gather that they were half aware of something which was happening, and the statement that they beheld no man naturally implies that Paul did see some man. There was much to tell about that scene; some of the details are omitted in this, as in every account, because in Luke's brief narrative it was not possible to mention everything.

In the second account, which Luke in Acts xxii. quotes from Paul's own mouth, there is no direct mention by Paul himself that he saw Jesus. But as to this we notice two facts. In the first place, Paul's object is not to compare himself with the older Apostles, as it is in 1 Corinthians. His purpose in this hurried, almost breathless, address to the Jews, who had been on the point of tearing him in pieces, was simply to touch their hearts. This was not the most suitable detail to select at the moment. In the second place, he quotes from Ananias, a Jew of high character and standing among the people, some details of this incident: the evidence of Ananias was likely to weigh with this audience. Ananias, as Paul says, visited him after some days, and recited to him as proof of his authority the whole incident; he reminded Paul of what had happened, and among other things, that he had been chosen "to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from His mouth." The point which seemed afterwards so important to Paul, when he was writing to the Corinthians, is here put first in the words of Ananias.

Accordingly, in every one of Luke's three narratives, we find that the detail on which Paul lays such stress in writing to the Corinthians appears as a feature of the incident, sometimes more emphasised, sometimes less, but always either implied or formally expressed. In every case the details which were selected stood in some relation to the urgent pressure of the moment. Neither Paul nor Luke ever gives an absolutely complete account, such as we should like to possess, of all the things that happened on this wonderful occasion: to do so would have required a book on a much larger scale than the Acts.

THE CHARISMATIC TYPE

Rudolf Otto

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT the charismatic type is plainest in Paul, who comes next to Jesus in this respect. Here we are dependent not on subsequent testimonies of Paul's admirers and disciples, but on his own indubitable words.

Suppose no personal, written remains and words of Paul's had survived, nothing that contemporaries said about him as in the We-narrative of Acts, but perhaps only an aretalogy or a "saint's life" from a later time, originating within the orbit of the post-Pauline churches where he himself had long been recognized as a saint and martyr (and that always means also the hero of a developing cult). How would it all look? What should we find?

Presumably we should find: *logia*, short summaries of his message; these would be fragmentary and probably oft-times impoverished, flattened, harmonized, polished, and overlaid with explanations of a later time. Perhaps they would be assembled by naïve and unschooled authors, who had included traditional material long handed down only in oral form by a memory which gradually became indistinct. Then again, this material would be embedded in a saint's legend which included historical data, poorly arranged in a "saint's life," and everything overlaid with the glitter of the saint. This "saint's life" would then contain things which the student of species would at once classify as typical fable motifs, as legendary travel motifs, as Hellenistic myths of gods and heroes; he would discover scenes which had been manifestly idealized, and would point out that accounts of the circumstances and the background had obviously been spun out of originally unconnected *logia*. Within the limits of what was manifestly a purely phantastic travel narrative describing the oddest zig-zag movements, he would discover maxims and apothegms, controversies with all sorts of adversaries, rudimentary discourses and teaching, fragments with the strangest changes of style, sober doctrinal sayings, and almost ecstatic outbreaks which would with difficulty be ascribed to one and the same author, descriptions of conventional situations, equally conventional types of opponents, purely Palestinian, plainly Hellenistic, and undoubtedly Gnostic material.

And all this would be found embedded in miracle narratives described as obviously fanciful. Let us make it more concrete: we begin with a scene describing a "call" by the personal appearance of the heavenly king—

From *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, translated by Floyd Filson, Bertram Woolf, London, 1938, pp. 337-43. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Lutterworth Press.

obviously an ideal scene, which clearly shows the characteristics of Hellenistic theophanies. Study of the history of the species shows it to be one of, and naturally just as unhistorical as, these theophanies. Revelation continues to come from the side of the heavenly king; alleged speaking with spiritual tongues—plainly a motif deriving from the most primitive of popular mythology; dreams and visions; healings and at least one raising from the dead, namely, that of the so-called Eutychus—Eutychus means the fortunate, even the name proves that we have to do here with an ideal scene; an appearance in a vision of a Macedonian from afar who brings a heavenly message; a visit of angels who announce a miraculous deliverance; probably also a miraculous blessing of bread, through which all persons on the ship receive a satisfying meal; a transport into Paradise, probably by now definitely in bodily form; a long-range operation over the sea from Ephesus to Corinth: indeed, an actual visit over the sea in the spirit to the Corinthians: a visit which is perhaps already recounted as a personal extorisation and apparition of one who was really far distant; powers of blessing and cursing, through which he delivers a sinner to the power of the devil; the gift of imparting the Holy Spirit by laying on of hands; in addition at least a dozen miraculous deliverances from all sorts of dangers which have befallen him, especially a deliverance from a storm at sea—a typical free-moving legend with known parallels in the rabbinic literature; especially also the prophetic gift of foreseeing his own future suffering. It would then be clear and indubitable to the sceptic that the well-known myth motifs of Hellenistic aretalogy have been transferred to an impressive preacher who had presumably once existed.

But unfortunately for the sceptic we now have authentic writings of this Paul and a largely trustworthy travel narrative from eye-witnesses of this man. These prove that free-moving Hellenistic fairy stories have not been transferred here but that the things mentioned really occurred, at least as subjective happenings. They are not the literary production of a posthumous church, but go back to events in an actually existent charismatic milieu and to the life and labour of a typical charismatic. Nor is Eutychus a fiction, in spite of his name. He really did fall out of the window upon his head, and Paul really awakened him out of his insensibility. Paul really did see the Macedonian in the dream, and in the danger at sea he thought he heard the voice of an angel. He really experienced the storm at sea, and in spite of the most beautiful free-moving fairy tales of Orpheus, Arion, and other mythical heroes, he was a charismatic who really knew that the storm would do him no harm. He really was the man who, fourteen years before, believed he was transported into Paradise, not knowing whether he was in the body or out of the body at the time. He really did foresee his sufferings as other charismatics have done. He not only believed in but possessed charismas. We should study him as a charismatic type, so that we can recognize it again when we meet it elsewhere and in a figure greater than Paul's.

Both the nature and the inner connection of the charismatic gifts may be recognized in Paul. The points to consider are:

The gifts do not in any way involve omnipotence or omniscience.

They are not magic powers such as a *goētēs* [sorcerer] thought he possessed.

They are mysterious heightenings of talents and capacities, which have at least their analogues in the general life of the soul.

They are not magic invasions into the life of nature; they do no violence to natural power nor are they magically increased natural powers. They work no nature miracles as portenta, miracula, prodigia, such as the standing still of the sun or the collapse of the walls of Jericho.

But they are:

Capacity for spiritual and psychic experiences of a distinctive kind.

Heightened talents such as *kubernēsis* [guidance] and *diakrisis* [discernment].

Operations of the soul and of psychic powers upon other souls, phenomena which indeed far surpass the limits of normal psychic operation, but are nevertheless rooted in the general mystery of the psychic processes of the will.

They form an approximately closed circle of possibilities which have a perceptible relationship of kind among themselves. They are regarded as of a miraculous character, and yet the charismatic knows himself to be different from the real miracle-worker and rejects miracle in the sense of a miracle of display, i.e. a nature miracle as portentum or prodigium.

Finally, an important note on this very point: Paul knew the powers of the spirit to be operative in himself and yet he censured the Jews in asking for miracles (1 Cor. i. 22):

The Jews require miracles; the Greeks ask for wisdom; but we preach Christ, the crucified.

Instead of adducing worldly wisdom and working miracles, he appealed to the preaching that was his duty. He did not appeal to any miracles which he worked.

Christ was a greater charismatic, and he also typically refused when the Pharisees demanded of him a real miracle in the technical sense. In the same way, also, he appealed instead to his preaching as the real sign (Lk. xi. 29). He censured the desire for miracles as the mental attitude of "an evil and adulterous generation." No more than in Paul's case does that mean that as a matter of fact he worked no miracles, and in another connection indeed he did actually refer to them. But he knew that his charismatic activity, miraculous as it was, could not be called miracle in the technical sense; it was not portentum or prodigium; not a nature miracle or a miracle of display, but the spiritual dynamis of the indwelling charis of the kingdom of God. In *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reich Gottes*, p. 142, Johannes Weiss says: "No mighty deeds succeed in being heavenly attestation."

So also with Muhammed. He was a charismatic in so far as he and he alone possessed the spiritual capacity to perceive the revelation of Allah, to hear the voice of the angel; in so far as he read the eternal Quran of Allah, and believed he had transcendent experiences and adventures. But just like Jesus he denied being a real miracle worker, and he likewise pointed to the spiritual miracle of the Quran instead of to portents. The same is also true of the later charismatics of Islam. Here the charismatic gifts are called *karamath*. But Macdonald, in his work: *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*, rightly says that these *karamath* are distinguished from the real miracles. The latter are called *mu'giza*, the "obvious" miracles, which are strictly distinguished from the *karamath*.

This distinction of charismatic activity from magical activity or from technical miracle working belongs to the very category of the real charismatic. The difference between charismatic working and the real miracle is never strictly defined, but it is felt and asserted so much the more definitely.

Another aspect of Jesus' charismatic works, as the Synoptics still imply, is that their effectiveness is largely dependent upon the faith of the recipient. In Mt. ix. 28 Jesus first asks the blind men:

Believe ye that I am able to do this?

In ix. 29 he says:

According to your faith be it done unto you.

In Mt. xiii. 58 we read:

He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.

Particularly noteworthy is the passage Lk. v. 17:

And it came to pass on one of those days, that he was teaching . . . and the power of the Lord was with him to heal.

In other words, the charismatic power had its particular hours when it was present for healing, and manifestly also those when it was not present. It is therefore stronger or weaker. It comes and goes.

In 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff. Paul mentions a whole catalogue of charismatic gifts. The gifts of grace are synonymous with ministrations and mighty work (*charismata*, *diakonia*, *energēmata*); here he classifies the word of wisdom, *logos sofias*, and of knowledge, *gnōseōs*; *pistis*, faith as mightily working (mountain-removing) faith; healing; *energēmata dynamēōn*, i.e. miraculous mighty works of a kind not closely determined; prophecy; glossolalia as ecstatic speech; the strange *diakrisis pneumatōn*, the distinguishing of spirits. In addition ch. xiii describes the religious functions in the narrower sense, such as charismatic love, and manifestly also faith and hope. Furthermore, we find in Paul: *horasis*, the gift of seeing in dreams and visions; ex-

periences of rapture such as his own transport into the third heaven; and the gift of exorcism, which Paul himself also exercises. Plainly he does not include everything possible among the charismatic gifts. Rather, he obviously restricts them to a definitely limited group of heightened psychic powers similar in character and flowing from a single pneuma. Their working is not unlimited. The gift of prophecy is not omniscience; the gift of healings is not omnipotence and not every sick person is healed; the exousia of the proclamation is not infallibility. The charismatic himself is not a completely exceptional, marvellous, and miraculous being, but has gifts which can really appear in all believers who have received the spirit. Taken together, however, they yield a definite spiritual type recognizable as a unity.

Paul traces the gifts of grace back to the pneuma. At the same time he knows this pneuma working in charismatic gifts is not, as it were, a speciality of his Hellenistic churches. Comparing himself with those in Palestine, he boasts, as we have said previously, that his church has *also* received what the churches in Palestine have previously received. But naturally the latter had it rightly and in the first place. The charismatic gifts and the pneuma were therefore not peculiarly Hellenistic, but originally and first of all Palestinian, a prime possession of the original church.

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL

Clarence T. Craig

THE MOST important single figure in the development of the early church was Saul of Tarsus. Because of the preservation of many of his letters, he is one of the best-known characters of the ancient world. He was the hero of the author of Luke-Acts and his missionary campaigns are the only ones which are traced in any fullness. We must not be misled by the greater information about Paul and forget that many others were engaged in the same work. Yet any story of the beginning of Christianity must of necessity give much space to him and to his work.

1. HEREDITY AND EARLY ENVIRONMENT

His birth may be dated near the beginning of the Christian era in the important city of Tarsus on the flat plain southeast of the Taurus mountain range. The present city lies five miles further inland than in that day because of the silting up of the Cydnus River. The city lay at the southern end of the trade route through the Cilician gates to Cappadocia and Asia Minor. It was a center of which the proud citizen could well say that it was "no mean city." The Jewish colony was large, and it may be that it comprised a separate "tribe" of citizens. When Paul referred in Romans 16:7 to certain "fellow-tribesmen" this relationship may have been in Tarsus.

Here in the dispersion there was not the same bitter hatred of Rome as the Palestinian Jews felt. Cultivated merchants of such a city could not be as isolated from gentile life. They were surrounded by artistic objects whose symbols were drawn from the gentile religious culture. Still, their food laws, sabbath observance, and devotion to the ancestral Torah brought an inevitable separation from the surrounding customs. The environment of Paul at Tarsus was not nearly as Greek as that of his contemporary Philo in Alexandria.

Saul was brought up in a strict Jewish home. He had been circumcised on the eighth day; his father traced his descent from the tribe of Benjamin, and this son had been given the name of the illustrious king from that tribe who had first thrown off the Philistine yoke. His Roman name, Paul, was the one used in intercourse with Gentiles, and it was one which he bore from the beginning. Some believe that his claim to be a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" meant that Aramaic was the language spoken in his home. The book of Acts pictures Paul addressing a Jerusalem crowd in Aramaic. Yet it is clear from his letters that Paul read his Bible in the Greek translation.

From *The Beginning of Christianity*, New York and Nashville, 1943, pp. 156-66. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.

He wrote in Greek as one for whom it had been his mother tongue since childhood. It is in the field of language that the Greek influence upon Paul is most certain.

Luke adds that Paul was "Roman born"; hence his father had been a Roman citizen before him. Paul's friendly attitude toward the Roman government would argue for the truth of this statement. On the other hand, from the account of his hardships undergone for the gospel, it is apparent that he suffered indignities which were illegal in the case of a Roman citizen. Possibly all officials did not stop to investigate fully before they beat him with rods. But his appeal to Rome, after being taken prisoner at Jerusalem, affords strong corroboration of his Roman citizenship.

Paul's family apparently belonged to the middle class. It is no indication of poverty that the son learned the trade of a tentmaker. To this day, Tarsus is a center for the weaving of tent cloth out of goats' hair. Rabbi Judah b. Ilai (A.D. 150) said, "Whoever does not teach his son a trade teaches him to become a robber." Throughout his work as an apostle of Christ, Paul was self-supporting. Since the appeal to Rome was inevitably an expensive legal proceeding, some have conjectured that Paul was cut off by his father when he joined the Christian faith, and shortly before this imprisonment he had come into the family estate. That is at best an imaginative possibility.

A second-century book of legends about Paul contains this picturesque description of his bodily appearance. He was "a man little of stature, thin-haired upon the head, crooked in the legs, of good state of body, with eyebrows joining, and nose somewhat hooked, full of grace: for sometimes he appeared like a man, and sometimes he had the face of an angel." The author of the Acts of Paul was probably drawing on his pious imagination, but in writing to the Corinthians, Paul himself admitted that "his bodily presence is weak." Later in the same letter he referred to a "thorn in the flesh." This has been interpreted as everything from malaria to epileptic fits. Modern psychologists have drawn elaborate pictures of Paul's periodic depressions, but these belong to our modern apocrypha. All that we really know about this "thorn in the flesh" is that it was a severe handicap to his work and so a "messenger of Satan." It was not removed by prayer even for such a man of faith as Paul, but he received divine strength to bear it. The one thing certain about Paul's physique is the enormous endurance of the apostle. A man who could trudge mountain and valley day after day, endure shipwreck and imprisonment, hardship and persecution, was no weakling. His restless energy drove him on with untiring zeal.

Brought up in an orthodox home, Saul received every opportunity to study the word of God. "At five years of age let children begin the Scripture, at ten the Mishnah, at thirteen let them be subjects of the law" (*Aboth* 5:21). So reads the early Jewish instruction. Whether there was a formal synagogue school in a city like Tarsus at this time we have no means of knowing. But when Paul the Christian quotes from about a hundred and fifty different verses scattered through one hundred chapters in the Old Testament it is clear that early in life he had attained an intimate

knowledge of scripture. It was his own claim that he went beyond those of his age in his knowledge of the Jewish religion and in zeal for the traditions of the fathers. He joined the strictest party, the party of the Pharisees, and could say of himself that as touching the righteousness of the law he was blameless.

Tarsus was the third university center of the ancient world. According to the geographer Strabo, it ranked after Athens and Alexandria. Athenodorus, one of the most noted Stoic teachers, had come from there. But we may be sure that this devout young Jew did not go to the university for instruction. The quotation from one of Menander's comedies in First Corinthians is no more indication that he had studied Greek literature than the words "To be, or not to be" on the lips of a modern American is proof that he is a Shakespearean scholar. Of course Paul could not help absorbing some influences from the pagan environment. He knew the vocabulary of athletic games, but certainly he had never stripped in a gymnasium nor joined in the contests. He readily absorbed the methods used in the cynic diatribe, and the phraseology of the Mysteries and of popular Stoicism. These influences were mediated through the circle of God-fearers surrounding the synagogue. But they were accepted without realization of any borrowing. Paul never ceased to be the Jew who abhorred the excesses of pagan life.

According to Acts 22, Saul studied at Jerusalem under Gamaliel, one of the leading rabbis of the time. Nowhere else is that claim made within the New Testament. Though Paul claims to have been a Pharisee he never says that he was a scribe. It cannot be said that his letters reveal evidence of formal rabbinic training. It is true that they contain samples of allegorical interpretation of scripture and legendary expansions of the law. On the other hand, formal Halakah is not to be found. Modern Jewish writers insist that Paul was far removed from the more optimistic teaching of Palestinian Judaism and that he must have been trained somewhere in the dispersion.

This question is wrapped up with the locals of Paul's persecuting activity. According to Acts, Saul witnessed the stoning of Stephen at Jerusalem, and then led in the endeavor of the Sanhedrin to root out the church. He was on a mission from Jerusalem to Damascus when the great change came in his life. Though Paul refers to his persecution of the church and locates his conversion near Damascus he nowhere states that he persecuted believers in Jerusalem. On the contrary, he insists that he was not known by face to the Christian communities of Judea. Taken strictly, these words would rule out the picture in Acts. But that may be too rigid a construction of Paul's statement. In any case, all accounts agree that the religious fervor of this young Pharisee led him to persecute those who blasphemed by believing that a crucified felon could be God's Messiah.

Many have wondered if Paul ever saw Jesus. There is nothing to indicate that he had. Nor are we to conclude from Acts 26:10, where Paul says that he cast his vote against the Christians, that he had been an actual member of the Sanhedrin. In that case, he must have been married. While some

scholars have contended that Paul was a widower, it is much more likely that he was a bachelor. This phrase merely indicates Paul's hearty participation in the aim to extirpate the sect of the Nazarenes.

2. THE SPIRITUAL PREPARATION

It is customary to speak of Paul's conversion. But he had never known a time when religion was not his supreme concern, nor when he did not serve the one eternal God with all the energy at his command. There was a moment, however, which completely divided one understanding of the purpose and will of God from another. In the midst of his devotion to God, his life was transformed from one center of loyalty to another. He was a twice-born man. Of the fact there cannot be the slightest doubt. Concerning many of the details, much uncertainty inevitably must remain.

Even the most sudden change is preceded by conditioning factors. The conversion of Paul was not without its preparation. The first factor was his *previous knowledge of the faith* which he was to adopt. The man who knows most about subversive activities is the man who makes it his business to root them out. When Paul debated with Nazarenes in the synagogues and followed them even into their homes, he must have become familiar with their message and their lives. Though he detested their error, he must have come to respect their sincerity. The more stubborn he found them in their faith, the more he learned that here were men and women who had found something worthy of devotion even to death.

A second element of preparation has often been found in the nature of *his experience under the Torah*. In his correspondence with the churches Paul wrote of the inability of anyone completely to obey the Jewish law. Many have believed that it was the torture of this discovery during his Pharisaic days which led to his conversion. In other words, the unsatisfactory religious experience of Saul, the Jew, paved the way for the revelation of Christ to him. Certainly there have been instances of intense activity on behalf of a cause which has been due to a desperate endeavor to hide an inner uncertainty. But was that the case with Paul?

The evidence for this spiritual bankruptcy in Paul's life is far from conclusive. It is chiefly sought in the seventh chapter of the letter to the Romans. Here Paul wrote that except for the law he would not have known what coveting was. But through the commandment of the law, he was guilty of this sin. Imaginary pictures have been drawn from this of a little Jewish boy succumbing to his desire for an apple. But a closer examination of Paul's words makes it clear that the "I" in this passage is only a literary form. There never had been a time in Paul's own life when he had been without law. This had been literally true only of Adam, in whom Paul's life of sin had had a certain beginning. The commandment "not to eat of the fruit of this tree" had awakened in Adam the coveting of its fruit, and the commandment which had been designed to save him had in fact slain him.

Paul went on to describe the struggle between the two selves and the two laws which were at war in his own body. Undoubtedly this was

a struggle with which he had had personal experience. But it would be truer to say that he was describing the way the life of an unredeemed man looked to Paul the Christian rather than giving a biographical report of his own pre-Christian experience. In contradiction to the hypothesis of an experience of failure in Judaism, there stand his indubitably biographical words, "As touching the law, I was blameless." We cannot say that he was in the midst of the bankruptcy of his Pharisaic legalism when Christ came to rescue him. The theory of the law in Romans was formulated to meet later problems in his missionary work.

There was, however, one other important point of preparation which is sometimes overlooked. From the standpoint of our complete contrast between Christianity and Judaism, we are apt to forget that Paul the Jew could have had no deeper longing than that God should send his anointed Messiah. Paul, the rigorous Pharisee, must have devoutly wished that the Nazarenes might have been right. If God would only send his deliverer to redeem his people! Of course, the idea that a crucified felon was the Anointed of God was blasphemous nonsense. But if it only could have been true that Messiah had come! The moment that Saul was convinced by some personal experience that this was the case, what we call his conversion was accomplished. We must never forget that Saul, the Pharisee, longed for the coming of that great day.

3. THE GREAT TRANSFORMATION

Our sources of information are twofold, the narrative of Acts and the references in Paul's own letters. Luke shows his appreciation of the importance of the event by recounting it three times. In addition to the original narrative in chapter 9, he has Paul include the story in the sermons in chapters 22 and 26. A light brighter than the sun shone about Paul and his companions, and he heard a voice saying, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" Luke emphasized the surrounding circumstances and the supernatural accompaniments. In some details, his presentations are inconsistent with each other. Who heard the voice and how many fell to the ground? More important differences concern the part of Ananias, the Damascus Christian, and the time of Paul's call to his gentile mission. But we must bear in mind that all these Lukan versions are at best secondary to Paul's own accounts of the change which had come to him.

Paul gives no details of the circumstances surrounding the event. He simply wrote, "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me." "God, who commanded light to shine out of darkness, shined in our hearts to give the light of knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The details are of little consequence beside this transforming fact. "Have I not seen the Lord?" Luke pictured a light of supernatural brightness, a literal voice from heaven, and physical blindness coming upon Paul. It is pointless to debate the correctness of this picture, for these things did not affect the real event. Nothing external had any special significance to any traveler to Damascus that day except Paul. Only on his mind had a light

shone; only to his consciousness had appeared a never-to-be-forgotten face; he alone obeyed a heavenly voice.

4. EXPLANATIONS OF THE CHANGE

Many have been the attempts to "explain" the conversion of Paul. Several types of "*medical*" explanation of the event have been offered. It has been suggested that he suffered a sunstroke. It has been intimated by those who believe that his "thorn in the flesh" was epilepsy that he suffered one of his fits. Either event must be recognized as possible, though never capable of proof. But in neither case are we one whit further along in our understanding of what we set out to explain. Of all the sunstrokes and all the epileptic fits in history, no other led to exactly this result. If such a physical situation accompanied the experience, we are still no nearer an explanation of the transformation of Paul's spiritual insight. The traditional interpretation has been to appeal to outright *supernaturalism*. A heavenly being, Jesus of Nazareth, was objectively present before Paul, spoke to him, and appeared to him. While Acts speaks only of a light and a voice, Paul himself insisted many times that Christ had appeared to him. He had seen the Lord. There cannot be the slightest doubt that he was sure in his own mind of the reality of that vision. Paul lived in a world where supernatural beings and supernatural happenings, in the most literal sense of the word, were taken for granted. That a scientifically-minded person of the twentieth century would have interpreted the experience in the same way is another matter. It must never be forgotten that of all those on the road to Damascus that day, only Paul saw anything unusual. No photographer could have snapped anything that would have revealed the cause of Paul's conversion.

The change which came to Paul, as every other great religious experience, was one within the soul and mind of Paul. That does not rob it of its reality. It defines the sphere where every religious transformation must take place. The supernaturalistic vocabulary which a Paul of the first century used to describe his experience must not be explained away. But neither should we allow it to stand between us and an understanding of its reality. Something happened to Paul which convinced him that Jesus was alive, that he was God's Messiah, that he had called Paul to his service. A convention of that age described this in terms of visions and heavenly voices. From our very different background no one of us could have the same experience in the same way. But we must let Paul be himself and speak in his own way. His life was changed because it had pleased God to reveal his Son in him.

Paul's conversion did not mean the changing of a bad man into a good man. His life now received a new center of loyalty in Christ. The transformation did not mean that Paul ceased to be a Jew. To the very end, the fate of his people was a matter of deep concern to this true Zionist. But now he believed that it was through Christ that the people of God would receive redemption. Henceforth he must be a herald of the good news of that redemption.

5. EARLIEST MISSIONARY WORK

The events immediately following his conversion are likewise difficult to trace because of the conflicting stories told by Acts and by Paul himself. Luke described how the Lord sent to Paul a Damascus Christian by the name of Ananias. Paul had his sight restored, received baptism, and was informed that he was to be an apostle to the Gentiles. But in his letter to the Galatians, Paul insisted that he was an apostle neither from men, nor through a man. We cannot help wondering if Paul did not have a story in mind like this one in Acts 9, and that he was protesting firmly against it. Of course Paul was baptized by someone, and it may well have been by a man by the name of Ananias. But Paul wanted to make clear that God had set him apart from birth, and his call to preach to the Gentiles had come directly from God and not through any human mediation. Since in his two other accounts Luke gives quite different versions of Paul's call to the gentile ministry, we are justified in refusing to assign great importance to the place of Ananias in Paul's entrance to the Christian church.

The Acts pictures Paul as beginning at once to preach his new faith in the synagogues. That fits in with the impulsive nature of the apostle. Paul himself said that he went into Arabia following his conversion and then returned to Damascus. Some scholars have pictured the former rabbi retiring to the quiet of the desert to work out the details of his new theology. That is most unlikely. Once convinced of the truth of the messiahship of Jesus, Paul must have thrown himself with vigor into the preaching of his new faith. There is no enthusiasm like the zeal of a new convert.

Paul tells us that three years later he went up to Jerusalem. The Acts also describes such a trip, but it is very difficult to harmonize the two versions. Apparently this was the time when Paul was let down in a basket through a window in the wall to escape the clutches of the officers of Aretas, the king of Arabia. The political relationships of Damascus at this time are obscure, but it would appear that Paul had stirred up trouble for himself in Arabia. Acts reports the same escape over the wall, but Luke ascribed the unceremonious haste to fear of the Jews. He gives no hint that three years have elapsed. Instead, he says that the disciples were afraid to associate with the man who had so recently been their persecutor. It was only through the friendly offices of Barnabas that Paul was introduced to the apostles. He was then able to preach boldly in and out of Jerusalem and dispute with the Grecian Jews until once more their murderous hostility made flight the better part of valor.

But Paul himself insisted that he stayed only two weeks in Jerusalem and saw none of the apostles except Peter and James, the brother of Jesus. Since he went on oath that he was speaking the truth, it is probable that he knew that contrary stories were in circulation. He said nothing of any public preaching but went on to write that the churches in Judea did not even know him by face. Since this visit was three years after his conversion, it is unthinkable that his change of position was still doubted at Jerusalem. Almost the only point on which the accounts agree is in the

itinerary—Damascus, Jerusalem, and then Cilicia. For Paul also wrote that he went to the regions of Syria and Cilicia. Antioch, the capital of Syria, is the next place where we find him, according to both sources.

Concerning the nature of this early missionary work we know little. This should really be called Paul's first missionary journey. . . . Luke believed that while isolated cases of preaching to Gentiles may have taken place earlier, the first real mission to them was carried on at Antioch. But it is clear that Paul did not originate this work. Though he became its most active champion, he was not the first to lead the way. We should picture him as one missionary among many, not yet the pioneering leader.

This was undoubtedly a period of growth and development in the life of Paul. It is not possible for us to describe just what Christian faith meant to him at this time. All of his own letters come from a much later period, and there are no earlier Christian documents by which a sure reconstruction could be made. In fact, we cannot state in detail to what understanding of Christianity Paul was converted. . . .

But from our knowledge of the mature Paul, we may be sure that he was already a marked man among the apostles of Christ. In the community at Antioch, he at once took a position next to Barnabas. At this stage they were the unquestioned emissaries for any important work within the church. Yet Paul's true greatness was manifest only when he struck out on his own independent missionary work. But that did not occur until the legitimacy of the gentile mission had been fully established.

PAUL—HIS RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

Edward I. Bosworth

THE INTENSE fervor of Paul's writings shows that they were in large measure the product of a profound religious experience. In order to understand them it is therefore necessary to discuss briefly the outstanding features of his religious experience. It is perhaps better to say that what appears in Paul's writings is his own interpretation of his experience made with reference to reproducing it in the lives of other men. A man's interpretation of his own experience is necessarily determined by, and expressed in the terms of, the pre-suppositions of his thought, the things he assumes without question.

.

PAUL'S PERSONAL RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

Paul was an intensely religious man before he became a Christian. The outstanding features in his religious outlook were two: the will of God as expressed in the eternal law of Moses (Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:6) and the Messiah who would through his cosmic judgment secure universal obedience to this law in the New Age. He was an enthusiastic Pharisaic Messianist, but at the same time a loyal Roman citizen, not a revolutionary zealot. This was possible because . . . he had the optimistic hopeful view of the future of the Gentile world that is found in the Pharisaic *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*. The Gentile world was desperately wicked (Rom. 1:18-32), but God meant the Jews to bring at least some portion of it into obedience to the law of Moses.

Paul very probably felt that a great revival of penitent obedience to the law on the part of God's people would bring the Messiah down from heaven. This idea appears in the Talmud (Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud* p. 334; cf. *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, Dan 6:4) and the idea that repentance would produce this result is attributed by the author of Acts to the primitive Palestinian Christians (3:19-21). This explains Paul's passionate hatred of Jesus and the Nazarenes. Jesus was thought by him to have opposed the rabbis at certain vital points in their effort to secure from the people such obedience to the law as would bring the Messiah from heaven to inaugurate the New Age. There must always have been a large element among the people that was either openly against the rabbis or very sluggishly responsive to them. The special zeal for the law which characterized Paul (Gal. 1:14) implies the existence of such an element. In the Gospel pages

From *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, New York, 1919, pp. 1-20. Reprinted by permission of E. F. Bosworth.

this element appears as the "multitudes," many of them "publicans and sinners," who gathered about Jesus. With them Jesus had become immensely popular as a prophet. This had made him an exceedingly dangerous person. One circumstance seemed to the rabbis to give the clue to a proper understanding of his real character, namely, his authority over demons. This could have been possessed by such a person only because he stood high in the councils of Satan (cf. Mark 3:22). He was one whom Satan had set forth to seduce the people from obedience to the law of God, to prevent the coming of the Messiah and the dawning of the New Age. Fortunately the Great Court had finally extorted from him a confession that he thought himself to be the Christ, and he therefore stood out clearly as an Anti-Christ. God's awful curse fell swiftly upon him and he hung in naked shame on the tree. The peril to true religion seemed to be safely past. But the Jesus movement was not dead. He who had been really a devilish Anti-Christ, cursed by God, was declared by his deluded followers, whose eyes Satan had blinded, to have been honored by God with a resurrection and to be the true Christ. The delusion seemed to be spreading rapidly through the nation. There was only one thing for earnest right-minded patriots to do under such circumstances and that was to kill the enemy. Paul sprang to the front with all the devotion of his deeply religious nature and became the leader in a campaign for the extermination of the Nazarenes (Gal. 1:13, 23; I Cor. 15:9; cf. Acts 22:4; 26:10). But now the movement began to show new and startling possibilities of peril to true religion. The fleeing Nazarenes went to the *Ghettos* of foreign cities, each individual there to become a fresh center of contagion. The Jews in these *Ghettos*, surrounded by pagan life and worship, competing for pagan trade in business, were always in special danger of losing something of their devotion to the holy law of Moses. If the Nazarene movement should strike its roots into this congenial soil, no one could calculate the harm that would be done! Unless the Nazarene movement was exterminated the Christ would not soon come down from heaven and the holy ideal which the good men of Israel were cherishing would not soon be realized. Rabbi Saul set out, therefore, an apostle of God's holy law, a missionary of Pharisaic righteousness, to prepare his people in all lands for the coming of Christ by destroying the Satan-Jesus movement.

There are hints (Rom. 7:7-25; cf. Acts 26:14) that Paul's religious life during this period was restless and contrasted strangely with the radiant hope and deep peace of the Nazarenes (cf. Acts 6:15; 7:54-60) from whom he conscientiously strove to extort penitent denunciation of Jesus (Acts 26:10-11).

This career of persecution was suddenly stopped by an event of revolutionary importance. Paul later described it as a direct act of God, revealing "his Son" to him within his inmost being (Gal. 1:16) where contact with the spirit world would most naturally be experienced and where Paul's wonderful subsequent experience found its sphere. It seemed to him later such an appearance of Christ as the Nazarene leaders had witnessed (I Cor. 15:5-8). He seemed to himself to have been "laid hold on by Christ Jesus"

(Phil. 3:12). The narratives in Acts (9:1-18; 22:3-21; 26:1-23) are in substantial accord with Paul's interpretation of the experience. Near Damascus (cf. Gal. 1:17) he suddenly found himself in the midst of an overpowering light. The heavenly "spiritual" world with its unspeakable "glory" had broken into this world of "flesh" as he had expected it to do whenever the Christ should be revealed from heaven. Could it be that the judgment day was here and that the Christ had come without waiting for the great repentance, for a law-keeping Israel, without waiting for the blasphemous Jesus movement to be stamped out? Then from the midst of the heavenly glory he saw a face (II Cor. 4:6) and heard a voice sounding down into the depths of his soul and saying in the language he had learned in the home of his infancy (Acts 26:14): "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?" "Who are you, Sir?" he said in terror. To his horror the voice replied, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom you are persecuting." Jesus, the Satanic blasphemer, who had been cursed on the cross by God, was in heavenly glory and possessed the Christ's own power to make heavenly glory break into the world of flesh! Saul was experiencing the Christ's judgment day. What would the Christ do to him? The voice told him to go on his way to his intended destination and find out there. He rose up a sinful man blinded by the glory of Christ's judgment day and yet not destroyed. He was still on earth among men whose hands of flesh he felt as in amazement they led him into the city.

For the purpose of understanding Romans it is necessary simply to recognize Paul's interpretation of this experience without discussing what actually happened. The present writer holds that the spirit of Jesus here actually met the spirit of Paul and made his presence felt in ways psychologically determined by Paul's temperament, previous history and present circumstances.

What was the effect of this tremendous spiritual shock upon Paul's religious outlook?

(a) First of all he learned to join the title "Christ," the title of holiness and glory, with the name "Jesus," the name of blasphemy and shame. He learned to say "Christ Jesus."

(b) He learned that Christ Jesus was kind, was full of "grace." One of the severest criticisms passed by the rabbis upon Jesus had been that he consorted in a friendly way with the most outrageous law-breakers, "publicans and sinners." Paul, overwhelmed with the sense of having fought against the Christ and killed his faithful followers, now finds this to be a true criticism. Jesus Christ has not destroyed him, has not blinded him for life, has not simply let him off with a threatening injunction to persecute no more. Jesus Christ has honored him with a high commission. Paul's great longing to prepare the people for the Christ's coming is to be utilized by Jesus, only instead of preparing for it by destroying the Jesus messianic movement he is to be made a great leader in the Jesus movement.

(c) That is, Paul received from Jesus Christ the grace of apostleship (Rom. 1:5). This never ceased to fill his heart with profound gratitude (I Cor. 15:9-10). From this time on Paul thinks of himself as one of a little

group of cosmic significance, upon whom the eyes of all the universe are, or ought to be, fastened. He is one of those who have been sent by God into the great arena of the universe just before the break up of the old age, a center of interest for the whole amphitheatre of heaven and earth; "I think God hath set forth us, the apostles, last of all, as men doomed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, both to angels and men" (I Cor. 4:9).

Paul is thought to say in Gal. 1:16 that he at once knew that he was to be an apostle to Gentiles. He certainly saw, as he looked back upon the event in the light of later developments, that God then purposed to send him to the Gentiles, that this had indeed been God's purpose for him at the time of his birth (Gal. 1:15). The statement in Gal. 1:11-24 is very condensed and may summarize what only gradually became clear. Paul had presumably long felt that the messianic plan of God included the Gentiles (*Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, Benj. 9:2; *Levi* 14:4; *Psalms of Solomon* 17:32), but of course as Jewish proselytes. It is not impossible that when he started out to cleanse the *Ghettos* of foreign cities from the Nazarene pest, he also hoped to win converts to Mosaism from among the Gentiles. There were missionaries of Pharisaism who made long dangerous journeys by land and sea for this purpose (Matt. 23:15). If this was Paul's frame of mind at the time of his conversion it may very well be, as the narrative in Acts seems to imply, that it took him a considerable time to learn from the logic of events the terms on which Gentiles might be included in the Jesus messianic movement.

(d) Paul had a new conception of God as a result of this experience. The unexpected "grace" of the Christ, who was Jesus, the friend of sinners, necessarily revealed unexpected grace in God who sent such a Christ and endorsed his friendliness by resurrection and exaltation to his own right hand.

(e) With this new conception of the grace of God and his Christ came a new conception of the terms on which God would deal with men through his Christ in the judgment day. Here Paul's experience came directly into evidence, for his experience with Jesus Christ had been a kind of preliminary judgment day. As he had settled down to a thankful, obedient acceptance of the commission of Jesus Christ he found himself in a strangely peaceful frame of mind. Such peace he very well knew could come only to one who had been set right with God. That which had set him right with God was certainly not the deeds of pious law keeping for which he had been famous (Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:6). They had not sufficed to keep him from an unrighteous fight against God's Christ. Without doubt that which had brought him peace was his humble, thankful acceptance of the control which Jesus Christ assumed over his life, that is, his "faith." . . . He learned through this experience the lesson of righteousness, or rightness with God, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. He afterward found this corroborated by the new meaning that he saw in the scriptural description of Abraham's religious experience: "Abraham had faith in God and it was accounted to him righteousness" (cf. Rom. 4:1-3). He learned here in experience his simple gospel of faith: "The word is nigh thee in thy mouth and in thy heart, that

is, the word of faith which we preach: that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. 10:8-9.)

(f) Paul found that faith in Jesus was not an isolated act but a permanent state. The Christ who had appeared to him in his very soul (Gal. 1:16) did not leave him. Christ's breaking into his inner life out of the spiritual world opened up a permanent connection with the spiritual world. He had an almighty, unchangeable friend in the spiritual world (Rom. 8:34-35). The powers of the spiritual world began to pour in and operate mightily in him, so that in an ecstatic state he "spoke with tongues" to an unusual degree (I Cor. 14:18), and could do such remarkable deeds as would be expected of an apostle of the mighty Christ (II Cor. 12:12). An abiding fellowship with Christ was established in his life, so that he prayed to Christ (II Cor. 12:8-9), felt that his missionary itinerary was drawn up by Christ (I Thess. 3:11), and that all his life was vitalized by the presence of Christ (Gal. 2:20). His whole conception of the Coming Age summed itself up in terms of the continuance of this relation: "So shall we ever be with the Lord" (I Thess. 4:17).

(g) It was now almost inevitable that he should change his conception of the function of the law. He realized at once that the men most devoted to the law were flagrantly unrighteous, fighting against God and his Christ. The sense of rightness that followed his interview with Jesus had come to him entirely apart from law. What then was the purpose of law? He may have hesitated at this point in his thought for a time. Later he reached the startling conclusion that the purpose of God's holy law was not to give men a chance to become righteous by keeping it, but to give the cosmic personalities, one of whom was "Sin," a chance to express to the full their evil disposition in leading flesh men to disobey law and incur death. In this way the law would make men realize their desperate situation and so would turn them to faith as their only resource (Gal. 3:23-24). . . .

(h) It was inevitable also that Paul should at once ask himself why the Messiah should die. He had often heard the persecuted Nazarenes give a reason when he had fiercely flung this question at them. He humbly accepted their answer when he became a Christian and passed it on to others in his preaching: "I delivered unto you among prime truths that which also I received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures" (I Cor. 15:3). That is, God willed it and foretold it in the scriptures. How the Nazarenes came to find in the scriptures an idea that had escaped the rabbis is not clear. They later attributed the discovery to Jesus himself. (Lk. 24:25-26, 45-46; Mk. 9:12; 14:21.) Paul must at once have asked why God willed it. How long it was before he found a satisfactory reply does not appear. That God could use the death suffering of righteous Jews to "ransom" and "purify" the nation was not an unfamiliar thought, at least in some circles (II Mac. 7:38; 4 Mac. 6:29; 17:21-22; *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, Benj. 3:8). To one whose religious thought rested on sacrificial pre-suppositions it would not have seemed unnatural that God should gather his people about him for a great purifying sacrifice on the threshold

of a vast new enterprise like that of the New Age. Paul later emphasized the idea that in Christ's death God was so revealing his love as to reconcile men to himself (e.g., II Cor. 5:19 . . .). It may at once have occurred to him that God was in this way stimulating the penitence that was requisite to bring Christ from heaven (cf. Acts 3:19-21). It is sometimes held that to Paul's mind the chief significance of Jesus' death and resurrection lay in the fact that they in some way gave him victory over the great cosmic personalities "Sin" and the "Elements" (Gal. 4:3, 9; Col. 2:8, 20). Jesus Christ came into Sin's world of flesh and won decisive victory over them by experiencing without harm to himself the worst that Sin and Death could do. This was because God was with him and by a resurrection from the dead exalted him to a superior place of power from which he could abolish the flesh age of Sin and Death by a world judgment. This is thought to be the meaning even of Rom. 3:24-26. . . . Paul was accustomed to present the subject of Jesus' death and resurrection in several ways. This seems pretty surely to have been one of them. But the evidence hardly warrants the conclusion that it was the only one and that it wholly supplanted the sacrificial analogy which certainly lay close at hand in Jewish and Greco-Roman thought.

(i) Paul's conception of the ethical life may have undergone some change as a result of his Damascus experience. It is clear that his conception of life in the New Age changed somewhat, because Jesus whom he had once abhorred was now recognized as Lord of the New Age, and the ideals of Jesus, so far as Paul understood them, would now necessarily be considered as dominating the Coming Age. This would involve some change in the ethical standards of the present life, not only because the New Age was so near, but because for the Christian the life of faith now as well as in the future was life with Jesus Christ. If Paul before his conversion had approved of the spirit of forgiving love so beautifully taught in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, then the necessary change would have been principally one of elimination. Certain features of his ethical ideal would have been shorn off. His ideal would have been simplified. It must have immediately become evident to him that, neither in the Coming Age nor at present, was the demand of the rabbis for the punctilious observance of their interpretation of the Mosaic law an essential part of the true ethical ideal, for Jesus was understood to have been against this. What Jesus' attitude toward the Mosaic law really was is another question, but it seems certain that he was understood to have been against certain interpretations of the law that seemed to the rabbis fundamentally important. Paul finally came to the place where the life of love seemed to him to be the comprehensive designation of the true ethical ideal (Gal. 5:14; I Cor. 13; Rom. 13:8-10), which was also the teaching of Jesus (Mt. 22:35-40). The simplification of his ethical ideal by a process of elimination may have required considerable time, but it must have begun as an immediate consequence of his interview with Jesus.

THE MAN MADE WHOLE

Arthur Holmes

ST. PAUL . . . formulated a system of world thought satisfactory to the sentiment of rationality, or desire for unity, through the God-man who through himself makes God and man one. A better example of personal unity could not be given than the oneness presented in Christ's humanity and divinity incarnate. From that concrete example as a center St. Paul drew his circle which included the whole world.

But does such a system of thought save a man? Does a systematic theology produce a unified personality? Was Saul of Tarsus himself remade when he remade his world-philosophy? These questions touch the second, or personal conversion of the Apostle, and bring to the fore problems of a practical religious nature.

The power in Christian faith is both natural and supernatural. It comes from God but expresses itself through the medium of conscious activities, the most powerful of which are the emotions and the will. Whether or not, in the last analysis, these two powers may not be reduced to one primary Energy, is a problem for metaphysicians and theologians. As describers of human consciousness we are here interested in the emotions, and especially as emotion appears in those regulated, organized forms known as sentiments. It is to these large and important acquired components of his character that we must look for the changes made in Paul's personality.

St. Paul's conversion, beginning on the road to Damascus, did indeed make vast changes in the man. But it did not literally "make all things new" in his personality. In the first place, he retained the same physical body, though perhaps somewhat mended in its organic functions, but still carrying with it whatever anatomical defects it suffered before, and surely with some of its chronic ailments and its liability to acute attacks of disease (II Cor. xii. 7, possibly the thorn was a new affliction; Gal. iv. 13). The old pains of "hunger and thirst" and "cold and nakedness" and all the other weaknesses and disabilities common to mankind appeared to fall upon Paul the aged (Phil. ix) as they do upon ordinary folk; and perhaps they gave him a sympathy and tenderness for others which he would not have had without his own experiences. At any rate, these afflictions he accepted as instruments for shaping in him the likeness of Christ (II Cor. xii. 9, 10).

From *The Mind of St. Paul*, New York, 1929, pp. 104-22. Reprinted by permission of the author.

His mind was changed into the mind of Christ. . . . These new mental elements were molded by him into ideals, one of the principal ones being the new ideal he framed of the man he longed to be. Thus two Pauls came into being, one ideal, the other actual. But there was no longer any conflict between the two. For the ideal was the image into which the actual was growing, and the actual was the ideal realized. He was in some degree like his Master and Model, but he still had far to go (Phil. iii. 13). He was a babe in Christ, but possessed of all the potentialities of full manhood (Eph. i. 23, iii. 19, iv. 13; Col. i. 19). He was alive in Christ, endowed with the Holy Spirit. His spiritual food was abundant, his exercise vigorous and constant (II Cor. ix. 8; I Cor. ix. 26, 27). These matters having been attended to, he could trust that in the secret recesses of his soul the new man was filtering in, driving the old man out as mineral-laden waters gradually transform a fallen tree into petrified facsimiles of its old forms. The visible power of St. Paul's transformation was the emotion that fired and quickened and made alive his well-formed theology.

St. Paul, with his wonderful intellect, conceived the identity of Jesus Christ and God in idea. That conception he enlarged into an idea of the God-man which encompassed himself, God and the whole world with all its nations, here and hereafter. But a man endowed with the mighty emotions of St. Paul could never rest with a mere system of theology. His thought must become dynamic; his faith must be energized with emotion (Gal. v. 6), and in turn work itself out into action (I Cor. xiii. 4-7). He was not enough Greek to be satisfied with philosophy alone; he was too much disgusted with formalism in worship to be satisfied with "works of the law" alone, and too much of both Jew and Greek ever to be contented with the rhapsodies of Oriental ecstasies alone.

Therefore he gathered up his whole personality—intellect, emotion and will—and organized his ideas of God, men, right, beauty, home and country, and all others, together with his primary, instinctive emotions congruent with his idea of Christ, together with all his rites and duties congruent with those emotions and ideas, into one organic compound actually functioning as a mighty power in his consciousness. The idea which performed this compounding was Jesus, the God-man. The resulting compound St. Paul called Love, sometimes Faith, sometimes the "new man." As into a mixture refusing to combine, Christ came into the separated parts of Saul, and those parts immediately fell into a compound, organically whole, faithfully functioning for an end, united forevermore in a personality, or new man. Peace and joy were by-products of this righteous functioning.

Saul of Tarsus never wanted for emotion. But . . . his feelings were in rampant disorder. From that commotion he was saved to a peace which, like the depths of the sea, is never disturbed whatever the surface turmoils may be. The salvation he found was threefold: (1) past (Eph. ii. 8, 9; Rom. v. 1, viii. 1); (2) present (Phil. ii. 12; Rom. xii. 1; II Cor. iii. 18; Col. iii. 3, 5; I Thess. iv. 1); and (3) future (Rom. viii. 18-22; I Thess. iv. 16; II Thess. i. 10; cf. Pet. i. 3-6). All of these in their essence contain some form

of oneness with God. The first secures the righteousness which unites with God instead of the sin which separates from God (Rom. v. 1). The second represents God working within the convert (Phil. ii. 12). The third suggests the bliss of endless life with God (I Thess. iv. 17), which is now enjoyed as a living hope (Rom. viii. 24), never-failing (I Cor. xiii. 13) and full of rejoicing (Rom. xii. 12), without which a man is miserable indeed (I Cor. xv. 18; Eph. ii. 12).

The powers which wrought this salvation in St. Paul were human and divine, but both bore the same name, Love. Within the human Love is lodged faith, another important word in salvation.

The Greek New Testament uses two words, *philia* and *agape*, for love, the latter being the word used to express the relation enduring between God and men. Possibly it is best translated by the words good-will, or the Anglicized Latin "Benevolence," or "Love" capitalized, so as to distinguish it from mere tender emotion. Such expressions at least lift it from its position of comparative sentimentalism to something like the dignity and power it should occupy in Christian meaning, where it is a sentiment of invincible might and eternal virility, as well as inexhaustible tenderness and mercy.

St. Paul's definition of it is found in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. In that immortal ode Love is plainly described as a sentiment. It has an object; it is integrally and necessarily saturated with emotion (I Cor. xiii. 1, 2), and it just as inexorably expresses itself in behavior (I Cor. xiii. 4-7). Without emotion it is the empty clangor of mere mechanics. Without behavior it is an equally futile rhapsodical and possibly hysterical or maniacal ebullition of feeling, or the weak and dissolving emotion of affection without intellect, purpose or will. This core of the Christian religion, this summary and spring of man's relationships with God, and man with man, this definition of the Almighty, which passes understanding, whose length and breadth and height and depth can be measured only by the Cross and the Christ, is the sentiment which made Saul of Tarsus whole.

How was such Love generated in the heart of the hater and persecutor of the Way? Being a sentiment it can be developed, maintained and strengthened, or allowed to diminish and die by neglect. It can be fixed upon any chosen object in two ways: by transferring it from some old beloved object to a new one by the simple process of showing that the new and old are really one; and by building up a sentiment *de novo* from instincts by devotion to any object. When St. Paul identified Jesus of Nazareth with the Messiah, he transferred to him whatever reverence he already held for the hero of his people. The nature of that emotion, on account of our ignorance about the idea of the Messiah held by Saul, may be very difficult to define, but we know that it changed by the revolution evident in the persecutor's behavior. What this comparatively mild and meager sentiment might have induced him to do, we have already con-

sidered above. It formed the emotion of his first conversion, or his acceptance of Jesus as the Christ.

But in addition to this acceptance, Saul also came to believe that Jesus was the Son of God and God himself. Immediately following upon this enlarged faith came the enrichment of his sentiment by the addition of all the reverence he had held throughout his life toward his God, and much more besides. For Jahveh now became his heavenly Father, revealed incarnate in the Son. All the filial affection that a man can bestow upon the most perfect of fathers St. Paul now lavished unreservedly upon God. That emotion constituted the new, warm, powerfully moving force of his sentiment; but his old training in Jewish reverence preserved it always from those "amatory flirtations" with the Deity which have too often degraded the dignified, virile and robust Love that Christians should exhibit toward the God of all the earth.

Saul's old sentiment toward Jahveh was specifically enlarged by his appreciation of the grace offered through Jesus Christ, which the recipient answered by gratitude. That organization is itself a complex sentiment. It is directed by an appreciative receiver of any favor toward the giver. In this instance the gratitude was unbounded. For where sin abounded, there did grace much more abound (Rom. v). St. Paul felt that he had received mercy utterly beyond the bounds of the most daring imagination to measure. Moreover, the gift was made at a fearful cost to the giver.

The development and maintenance of the sentiment of Love as an actual, all-powerful, constantly dynamic force in St. Paul's mind is the key to all that unstinted devotion to God's service which he so abundantly displayed throughout his ministry. He himself confidently assumed that the same kind and degree of Love would be developed in all his disciples. All too sadly perhaps, he found that even in his own day the Love of some, if ever it was fired to any warmth, tended to wax cold. The later generations of Christendom, except in its great leaders, have not only shown Christian Love much diminished in warmth, but the church has not always been able to develop the sentiment much beyond a hybrid compound of awe for God in which fear plays the larger part, and tender emotion is weak indeed.

St. Paul nowhere makes the blunder of assuming that such Love could be commandeered into being. On its way to perfect unity his thought has passed far beyond the Jewish conception of two great commandments (Mt. xxii. 34-39; Jno. xiii. 34; Rom. xiii. 9). Much less does he sum up the whole matter of religion in terms of primitive feelings like fear (Eccl. xii. 13; II Tim, i. 7). With all clarity, like the Gospel of John and the Epistles under the same name, he sees in Jesus Christ a winsome, powerfully attractive, and startlingly tender revelation of God who loves all men with a consuming and passionate devotion; a Father who is not far off, but one who like Jesus himself walks in the midst of his family. And, as the children thronged around Jesus, so St. Paul expected them to rally round this God in joyous communion with him (Rom. v. 8, 5; I Jno. iv. 10, 19). This view of God, unfortunately, is somewhat overlaid by the Apostle's em-

phasis upon his own worried state before he was converted, and by his preliminary emphasis in Romans upon man's sinfulness. But such melancholy emotions toward God were entirely eradicated by the free pardon and the absorbing, living Love which God revealed to him in Jesus Christ.

The new Love was in one sense not a gift from God (Gal. v. 22). It was made from natural instincts already in the man. It organized itself in obedience to laws planted in human nature by the Creator. Around the idea of God in Paul's mind, primary emotions from instincts collected themselves, became an integral part of the idea, and of the actions which flowed from them. In this there was no straining on his part. Love grew like the lilies of the field.

How did this all-powerful sentiment of Love, or Good-will, function in St. Paul's salvation? In all three stages of it, it worked negatively and positively. Love crucified the "old man" by the "expulsive force of a new affection," and it edified the "new man" after the image of him who created him (Col. iii. 5, mortification, cf. iii. 10, being renewed; cf. Eph. iv. 24, etc.). From indifference or hatred toward many things and many people, the persecutor changed his attitude to Love for everything and everybody. In that flood of infinite Love which Jesus let loose on earth, St. Paul could not escape loving even himself for whom Christ died (Gal. i. 20; Eph. v. 29). That Love gathered up into one whole his religious, moral, patriotic and all other sentiments, and through that unification he gained that self-respect which gave him peace.

In the first place, the grace of God, offered so freely in pardon through Jesus Christ, gave him instant freedom from the sense of guilt. This relief, this peace, this unquenchable joy of justification have been felt by many converts (Rom. v. 1). Next, it conferred upon him a positive righteousness never to be taken away. Worry about sin and punishment was swallowed up in the joy that came from a realization of God's Love for him.

Then the answering Love for Jesus joyously bound St. Paul to the eternal task of drawing ever more closely to him in principle and character. This launched him upon the uncharted liberty of choosing methods and means of transforming himself into that Christlikeness as nearly as eternal circumstances permitted. Henceforth, for this converted legalist, religion instead of being a safe-in-shore, careful observance of commandments becomes the adventurous embarkation of a soul upon the trail of the shining Christ, Adam's breathless, heaven-assaulting emprise of becoming like God.

The second stage of his salvation actually began when he set himself to work out his own salvation. It, too, had its negative and positive parts. Some of his inborn instincts and some of his acquired sentiments were forever annihilated. The "old man" was nailed to the cross, but his death was not instantaneous; he continued to struggle with a broken and decreasing power. "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me," is the dying sinner's and quickening saint's pean of victory.

To change from figure to fact, it would be interesting to distinguish

between St. Paul's condemnation of inborn instincts and acquired sentiments; but the task is impossible, rendered so by his failure to separate them. As the emotions of sentiments are compounds of the primary emotions in instincts, the merging of the two has its psychological justification. The Apostle included both under the term "flesh." Galatians (v. 19-21) recites a list of the "works of the flesh," mingling instincts and sentiments indiscriminately (cf. also Eph. iv. 17-31).

Opposed to "flesh," a settled disposition to sensuous and selfish desires, Love, a settled disposition to do good, worked negatively and positively within the convert. It excised with a strong, determined hand one whole class of sentiments from his being. That was hate, with all its cognates, with all its kindred demons under whatever names and guises they might masquerade. No subterfuge—like loving the man but hating his acts—could for a moment confuse the single-eyed Paul. Hate, like a stone sheltering poisonous insects, covers a host of vicious instincts which excoriate the Christian's soul, dwarf his growth, paralyze his power. From these St. Paul shook himself free like a dog coming out of muddy water.

Likewise Love, if it never quite eliminated, at least greatly subdued the persecutor's ready pugnacity with its attendant anger. A doubtful passage, "Be angry [*orgisdesthe*] and sin not" (Eph. iv. 26), stands close to another condemning all "wrath and anger" (Eph. iv. 31; cf. Col. iii. 8), which is quite in harmony with the Apostle's general teaching on the subject. As a psychological fact, anger may reside in Love and yet not sin. But when it is thoroughly understood that Love punishes purposefully, even as a surgeon full of kindness cuts deep (I Cor. v. 4, 5; II Cor. ii. 5-8; Heb. xii. 6), it is seen that there is no further use for hate. It is eliminated by the "expulsive force of the new affection," Love, which keeps its intention fixed unwaveringly upon the good of the beloved one—a most difficult task for saints to perform. For "when a man has acquired the sentiment of love for a person or other object, he is apt to experience tender emotion in its presence, fear or anxiety when it is in danger, anger when it is threatened, joy when the object prospers or is returned to him, gratitude to him that does good to it, and so on," through a host of other derived emotions. Thus does the general sentiment of love admit within its fold a wide diversity of emotions, some of which the Christian must rigorously exclude.

Nowhere in Saul's salvation is this blending power of Love better manifested than in the positive work it did upon those two opposing instincts so marked in the young Hebrew—his instinct for self-assertion, and its antagonist, the instinct for self-suppression. In his pre-Christian career these two inborn impulses strove with one another irreconcilably. But in the convert's new Love for Christ, with its object of making both himself and others Christlike, these two contrary forces of consciousness were amalgamated in the melting pot of Love for Christ. The flux that accomplished their fusion was the purpose of Paul's life and his method of attaining it.

His aim was to make men Christlike. To do that he must make them

ministers doing service for each other (Mk. x. 45; Mt. xx. 28). The graving tools used for sculpturing the lines of Jesus' character must not be the hard and harsh instruments of worldly power, requiring physical might for their manipulation. "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight," said Jesus before Pilate (Jno. xviii. 36), and St. Paul followed that principle (II Cor. x. 3, xi. 7; Eph. vi. 12). Not by crude implements of matter, but only by the delicate and exquisite influence of the Spirit can the lineaments of Jesus' personality be engraved in the faces of men (Mt. v. 9; Jno. xiii. 33, 34; cf. Zech. iv. 6).

If then, not worldly strength of character, but humility and meekness, are the marks which the engraving tool must leave, then such work may be done by the example of the weak and lowly. If they endure under trial, and by endurance with thanksgiving, like Stephen, win involuntary homage to the Christ, their very weakness glorifies the Master. "Wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake; for when I am weak, then am I strong," is the very height of St. Paul's final victory over both self-submission and self-assertion (II Cor. xi, xii; I Cor. xiii. 4-7; Phil. i. 20). Either one alone is insufficient; blended they form an alloy of character invincible in its power to endure. They can be brought together only in that fusing retort of perfect devotion to Christ and his work. Their combination marks the first step in that higher synthesis of Paul's character and personality ending in his complete integration in Christ.

The positive side of the second salvation, of St. Paul's growth into the likeness of Christ—his edification, or sanctification—presents in itself two distinct aspects. The new man was partly ideal, partly real; partly realized in the Apostle's feeling, thinking and acting, and partly held before his mind's eye as a goal to be achieved by fixing his whole attention upon Jesus Christ and forgetting the things behind, upon pressing on toward the fullness of the stature of Christ.

In that process of transformation two powers were at work; the normal faculties of the man and the divine power of God, coöperating like two men sawing, one invisible under the log in a pit, the other visible, doing his part above the log in the open. The constant coöperation of these two is mentioned in many significant passages in St. Paul's letters (e.g. Phil. ii. 12; Rom. xii. 1-3; II Cor. iii. 18). In general, on the human side, the edification of the new man can be described as the operation of the sentiment of Love kept alive and vivid in consciousness by a constant and deliberate and thoughtful devotion to Jesus Christ, in mind, heart and will.

A thorough analysis of the manner in which Saul was changed into St. Paul would lead to an almost endless dissection of his every thought, feeling and volition. Both his inherited and his acquired character would be compelled to submit to a searching scrutiny. His instincts, or inherited dispositions, would manifest their complete reorganization. Next, all his sentiments, old and new, organized from his instincts, would reveal marks imprinted upon them by the incoming Savior. All the convert's intellectual, emotional and volitional processes would pass in review and present in

themselves the effects of his whole transformation. His physical being would command its share of attention. Nothing would escape, for his conversion reached down to the uttermost depths of his soul and played upon every fiber of his being until it vibrated with the new life and throbbed with the new power. Into such minutiae it is manifestly impossible for us to go, and we must be content with treating only some of the salient features of that all-embracing transmutation.

The two instincts just treated, self-assertion and self-submission, were absorbed and combined with other emotions in the self-regarding sentiment which aimed to transform St. Paul into the likeness of Christ. Did he accept the man Jesus as a perfect example of what he himself wished to be, and then render him due hero-worship? This process might have satisfied the self-regarding sentiment alone. But it would have made of Saul a smaller man than he became. For his full personality not only included a self-regarding sentiment satisfied with an ideal concretely presented in Jesus, but it also combined in that same new personality his religious sentiment directed toward the Absolute as a whole, with his new moral sentiment bringing within its scope every fellow man on earth, together with his patriotic sentiment, and with these all his minor sentiments. He thus became an actual hierarchy of sentiments, molded together, bound in a fedecacy, built into a monarchy, as vigorous and efficacious for the government of the individual as an absolute dictatorship is for the control of a nation. All of this self-organization was accomplished under the spur of the sentiment of rationality, which works as powerfully in forming a personality as it does in formulating a system.

As in his moral struggles Saul was engaged in one of his sharpest inner conflicts, so in his new-found Christian morality he discovered one of the chief factors in his self-integration. Needless to say, he did not discard or for the first time receive his moral sentiments. Conscience in him was always agitatingly alive (Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16). As he always felt the disapprobation of the voice within even at the contemplation of wrong, and its warm approbation of right, so he continued to hear the voice. But instead of conscience calling upon him to revere a body of dead statutes, it urged him to copy the spiritual image of a living man. He had cleansed his conscience from dead works to serve the living God, is the way another writer puts it (Heb. ix. 14). In his Jewish days, to be legally correct was to be Pharisaically righteous. In his Christian days, to be right with God was to be legally correct (I Cor. x. 23-31, iv. 2-4; cf. Rom. iii. 7, 8). In short, his Love for the God-man, Jesus Christ, was the motive power within him moving him, as conscience, to do what he thought would make him Christ-like.

But how did this Love for Christ become his moral impulsion toward his fellow men? Just what the movement was in St. Paul's mind is not clear. Unlike the process in John's letter (I Jno. iv. 19, 11; cf. John iii. 16), St. Paul, who also sees clearly that God always loved man (Gal. ii. 20; II Cor. v. 19), himself passed from the perfectly natural and universal

love of a man for himself to that higher and wider Love for God and for men (Eph. v. 29; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14). If they are all one, it makes little difference whether Love descends from God or rises from self; all loves meet in Love.

No ethics worthy of the name spends itself developing the individual's own soul. To be morality it must reach out beyond one's own person to others. The transition is easily made by human nature, though not so easily by logic. The process is accomplished by the very common act of relating the new object with the old object upon which affection has hitherto been lavished. "Why," asks Professor James, "does the maiden interest the youth so that everything about her seems more important and significant than anything else in the world?" Why cherish faded flowers, old gloves, baby's shoes, and gifts sanctified by friendships unalterable? "Love me, love my dog!" replies the common-sense man sententiously, implying that, in some sense, he and his dog are one. So with Christian morality which makes all men potentially one with God, and therefore one with each other.

So in Jesus Christ St. Paul found the organizing, unifying ideal of himself, and in his Love for Christ he found the inwardly working power which made him approximate more and more closely the Ideal Man he held close to the heart of his imagination. Logic which identifies, and so builds systems of ideas through reason, was thus satisfied in the Love which united the man and his world into one whole in God.

By such an ideal was Saul, a forlorn and divided self, a cabined, cribbed, confined legalist, transformed into a man wholly new, fresh, strong, breathing into his lungs, as it were, a vast freedom, lifting himself upright as from the easement of an impossible burden, suddenly inspired by a limitless spirit to do good, and endowed with a tireless and efficient power to do it. Specifically stated, Saul was unified, integrated, harmonized. His various instincts were made subservient to an ideal. His sentiments were organized into a monarchy with Love for God supreme. His whole being was saturated with the new sentiment, in which gratitude for grace abounded. His sentiment of rationality found full and concrete satisfaction in an Absolute, a Whole, which in thought and practice was specifically focused upon the God-man. No religion could go farther in satisfying the yearning heart of a man hungering and thirsting after righteousness. No religion could give greater peace in the sense of an inner and outer wholeness. No religion could give a more perfect satisfaction of the sentiment of rationality, man's intellectual desire for maximum unity, than this religion of the God-man who in himself unites religion, morality, estheticism, philosophy—the good, the true, the beautiful—and who, at the same time, by the sentiment of Love for him in the Christian's own life, organizes that disciple into an Ideal Man around the Christ, and also inspires that same disciple to use every available means, natural and supernatural, uninterruptedly to grow into that Ideal. A universal idea—God—is thus joined with a universal urge—the sentiment of rationality—to produce Christian behavior. The result

is a universal religion. The sentiment dominating this whole process is the hunger for unity, the impulse in the mind of man urging him to simplify by combining his ideas into some kind of whole.

Beginning as an unconscious impulse, it becomes a passion. As a sentiment it has for its object the largest possible unity or all-inclusiveness; its feeling of dissatisfaction in the face of diversity, and its peace when wholeness is achieved or approached; its theoretical activity in human reason always moving onward toward more unity, and its practical activity always building up men into more unified personalities and simplifying machines and societies as means to this end. Peace always, and sometimes the joy of achieving an intensely desired goal, are its by-products. Blessed is the state of that man who has found an eternal ideal which never can fail nor ever be achieved—oneness with the Absolute, or Whole.

PAULINE CHRONOLOGY

James Moffatt

WHEN THE Scillitan martyrs were asked what they had in their satchel or chest, their leader Speratus replied: "libri [αἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς βιβλοι, *i.e.* the gospels] et epistulae Pauli uiri iusti." This was in A.D. 180. But the unique position assigned by the church to Paul's epistles can be traced back to the age preceding Marcion. Marcion drew up an edited collection of the apostle's letters. The church's collection may have been due to self-defence, but the probability is . . . that as Marcion's edition of Luke was constructed out of the church's third gospel, so his Pauline canon was "a similar réchauffé of an existing Pauline collection in the church." Whether this *corpus Paulinum* can be dated as early as the age of Ignatius, or even earlier (as Zahn argues), is a question which can only be asked, in the paucity of the available evidence. It is hardly likely that the idea of such a collection occurred to Paul or to any one during his lifetime, but if the church at Philippi was anxious to possess any extant letters of Ignatius (Polyk. *ad Phil.* 13), it is reasonable to infer that a similar desire must have already prompted local collections of Paul's letters, long before there was any thought of ranking them with the scriptures (2 P 3:16). This would be rendered possible by the close communications between churches, not only in one district but abroad. What is certain is that the early Christian literature begins for us with Paul's correspondence.

Genesis, says Tertullian in the fifth book of his treatise against Marcion, *Genesis promised me Paul long ago*. For, he adds (playing on a Latin rendering of Gn 49:27), *when Jacob was pronouncing typical and prophetic blessings upon his sons, he turned to Benjamin and said, "Benjamin is a ravening wolf; in the morning he shall devour his prey, but towards evening he shall provide food." He foresaw that Paul would spring from Benjamin, "a ravening wolf, devouring his prey in the morning": that is, in early life he would lay waste the flocks of God as a persecutor of the churches; then towards evening he would provide food: that is, in his declining years he would train the sheep of Christ as a teacher of the nations*. This fanciful exegesis of the African Father brings out the fact that Paul did not begin to write the letters by which he is best known until he had been a Christian for about twenty years. So far as it can be reconstructed from the extant sources, the activity of Paul as a Christian evangelist and apostle falls into two main periods of passages. The first of these, (a) covering about seventeen years, includes his work in τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας, with Tarsus

From *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, New York, 1923, pp. 60-64. Used by permission of the publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons.

and Antioch as his headquarters (Gal 1:21 f., Ac 9:30 11:25 f.), and Barnabas as his main coadjutor. The second (*b*) dates from the crisis at Jerusalem, which impelled him to go further afield (Ac 15:36 f. 16:6 f.); after hesitating about his route and sphere, he started upon the great mission to Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Achaia, which occupied him for six or seven years (Ac 19:21, cp. Ro 15:23). His coadjutors now were principally Silas and Timotheus. Thereafter he was evidently planning a mission to Spain. The Southern Mediterranean he probably passed by, as Egypt was being already evangelised, but in the Western Mediterranean he hoped to break fresh ground, and *en route* to Spain he arranged to pay a long-deferred visit to the church at Rome. Meantime, he had to discharge his duty to the church at Jerusalem, by handing over the proceeds of the collection made by the Christians of Macedonia and Achaia on behalf of the poor saints in the Jewish capital. The untoward result of his visit is well known. He left Jerusalem a prisoner, was confined for two years at Caesarea, and finally reached Rome in custody. So far as we can see, he did not regain his freedom. The projected tour to Spain had to be abandoned, and he never revisited Asia Minor.

	C. H. Turner	Wellhausen	M. A. Brassac	Bartlet	Cornely	Harnack	McGiffert	Zahn
Crucifixion of Jesus	29			29	29	29/30	30	30
Conversion of Paul	35/36	31	36	31/32	34	31-33	31/32	35
First visit to Jerusalem	38		38-39	34/35	37	33	34/35	38
Second visit (Ac. 11:27 f. 12:25)	46		44	46	42	[44]	45	44
First mission tour	47		45-48	47	46	45	bef.45	50-51
Council at Jerusalem	49	44	49	49	51	47(46)	45	52
Second mission tour.	49		49-52	49	51	47(46)	46	52
Third mission tour	52		53-58	52	55	50	49	54
Arrest in Jerusalem	56		58	56	59	54(53)	53	58
Arrival in Rome	59	56	61	59	62	57(56)	56	61
Death of Paul	64/65	58	64	61/62	67	64	58	66/67
Death of Peter	64/65				67	64	64	64

The extant letters of the apostle fall within or after the second period, that is, in the late afternoon of his career. If he wrote any letters previous to the crisis at Jerusalem, they have perished. The letters to the churches of Thessalonika, Galatia, Corinth, and Rome date from (b); the rest of the epistles, so far as they are genuine, are the correspondence of a prisoner, and were composed either at Caesarea or more probably at Rome. Their relative order can be determined with approximate accuracy, but their exact dates are bound up with chronological calculations based on Tacitus and Josephus, as well as on early Christian tradition, which are still matters of dispute. [The table below], reflecting the schematism of the three journeys, will give some idea of the variety of opinion upon the chronology of the apostle's life.

A word may be added on the problem of the authenticity of the Pauline letters. Their criticism has passed through a phase corresponding, for example, to that which has occurred in the artistic estimate of Giorgione's pictures: after successive verdicts which unreasonably reduced the number of the genuine to a minimum, the application of a less rigid and more accurate standard has at least revealed the existence of a larger number

[illegible]

of authentic canvases in the one case and of epistles in the other. This shift of critical opinion has been brought about, for the most part, by a gradual recognition of the fact that writers and painters do not always work at the same pitch of excellence. The progress of historical criticism on Acts and, to a less degree, on the sources of the gospels, together with the recent researches into the *κοινή*, gnosticism, and contemporary Judaism, has also helped to determine the authenticity of several Pauline letters which were suspected half a century ago. "It has been the mission of the nineteenth century to prove that everybody's work was written by somebody else, and it will not be the most useless task of the twentieth to betake itself to more profitable inquiries." . . . The epistles to Timotheus and Titus, together with Ephesians, are probably Pauline rather than Paul's; they belong to the class of literary *ἀδέσποτοι* in early Christianity. Otherwise it may be assumed that the letters which are grouped under Paul's name in the canon were written by him, whatever process of editing they may have passed through before their incorporation into the sacred collection of the church.

[THE PAULINE CHRONOLOGY]

John Knox

WE HAVE NOTED more than once the fact that Paul's letters, although they tell us much about himself and his thought, provide us with very little information about the external facts of his career. It is this omission, altogether natural in letters and to be expected, which accounts for our tendency to rely upon Acts except at the points where one of Paul's occasional remarks absolutely requires that we recognize an error. Many writers seem to proceed on the assumption that for some reason Luke was more accurately informed on matters concerning which Paul happens to be silent than on matters concerning which Paul happens to have spoken. One of them once said to me, "But if we cannot rely confidently upon Acts, what is left us? We would not be able to write a life of Paul at all"—as though such a consideration had anything to do with the question of the reliability of Acts! Suppose we are not in position to write a life of Paul in the sense of a dependable, consecutive, and somewhat circumstantial account of his career—are we not in precisely that position with respect to the life of Jesus? As we noted in the first chapter, we are in danger of allowing the accidental fact that only Luke wrote about Paul, whereas he and several others wrote about Jesus, to blind us to the possibility that the practical and literary purposes of the author of Acts or his predecessors have had effects upon the traditions they received not less considerable than the effects which similar purposes are generally acknowledged to have had upon the earliest traditions of Jesus' life. In other words, we lack the "controls" for the "life" of Paul which the several Gospels provide for the life of Jesus.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that we are altogether deficient in this respect. The letters of Paul give us more information than is commonly recognized and provide us at certain important points with an effective "check" on the Lucan account.

Let us imagine for a moment that only Paul's letters had come down to us, that the book of Acts had either never been written or had perished without leaving a trace—in that case, what could we know about Paul? It is clear that we could know as much about the personality and thought of Paul as we can know now; but what about his life in the external sense? . . .

The relevant autobiographical material in the letters is [to be found in Gal. 1:13-2:10; I Cor. 16:1-4; Rom. 15:23-32]. Reducing this to outline form, we have something like the following:

From *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, New York and Nashville, 1950, chs. iii and v. Reprinted by permission of the author and the publishers, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.

- I. Conversion in Damascus—Gal. 1:15-17
- II. Three years or more, spent largely or entirely in Syria and Arabia—Gal. 1:17-18
- III. First visit to Jerusalem after the conversion ("acquaintance"), and departure for Syria and Cilicia—Gal. 1:18-20
- IV. Eleven years or more, presumably passed in activity as an apostle—Gal. 2:1
- V. Second visit to Jerusalem ("conference")—Gal. 2:1-10
- VI. Activity in churches of Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, and Greece, especially in connection with raising the offering for the poor at Jerusalem—Gal. 2:10; I Cor. 16:1-4 (also II Cor. 8-9); Rom. 15:25-32
- VII. Final visit to Jerusalem ("offering")—I Cor. 16:4; Rom. 15:25-32.

Before examining the significance of these items, let us note briefly a rather curious fact to which this outline as a whole calls attention. This is the fact that whether we consult Paul's letters or Acts with a view to reconstructing Paul's career as an apostle, the materials furnished us require that we organize it with reference to visits to Jerusalem. We have seen that Luke, as Burton Scott Easton puts it, "gives a Jerusalem frame to all of Paul's ministry, from his departure from Damascus to his final arrest." We have accounted for this "frame," as Easton does also, by certain elements in the "theory" of Luke-Acts. But now we note that most of Paul's own references to events in his career as an apostle emphasize his relations with that same city. There are differences, however: Paul mentions three visits and Luke five; but, much more important, Paul is concerned for the most part to show his independence of Jerusalem and mentions his visits, at least those noted in Galatians, to demonstrate their limited number, meaning, and effect, whereas Luke represents Paul as being gladly subordinate to Jerusalem. The fact that Paul mentions these visits, however, reminds us that this matter of Paul's relations with Jerusalem was a matter of controversy, not only in the period of the Marcionite controversy and, earlier, in the period of Luke-Acts, but also within Paul's lifetime. Paul's own attitude toward the apostles in Jerusalem was almost certainly somewhat ambiguous, a mixture of loyalty and respect on the one hand and, on the other, a resistance to any assumption on their part of superior status or authority. Marcion and his predecessors emphasized exclusively one element in this compound and Luke the other, but the issue of the number and nature of Paul's contacts with Jerusalem was important from first to last. Paul says there were only three visits, and that they had the purposes indicated in our outline by the terms "acquaintance," "conference," and "offering."

Now this last statement is bound to draw the objection that it goes beyond the evidence: Paul, to be sure, *mentions* only three visits, but he says nothing, one may argue, to indicate that there were not others. The point is crucial. The whole answer to the question whether an inclusive and coherent, even if quite summary, pattern of the length and course of Paul's career as an apostle can be gathered from the letters alone depends upon whether this objection is sound. I believe it is *not* sound. Paul's language in the passages quoted can reasonably be taken to mean not simply three visits but three visits only.

We can count on everyone's agreeing that when Paul "went up again to Jerusalem" after "fourteen years" (Gal. 2:1), he was making only his second visit. His whole purpose in this passage in Galatians requires that he be accurate on this point. That he is being careful in his statement appears not only in its definiteness but also in the oath he takes to its truth (1:20). Occasionally it is suggested that he may have been mistaken—perhaps he was forgetting a trip or two. But this suggestion is rarely made, and never with much conviction. Paul would hardly have made an error so egregious or one which would have laid him so open to opponents who apparently were representing his relations with Jerusalem in somewhat the same way as Luke-Acts later represents them. No, it can be known, as surely as such facts can ever be known, that when he went up to Jerusalem "fourteen years later" (V in the outline), he had been up only once before since his conversion.

But on what grounds can we assume that there were no visits to Jerusalem between this second visit and the final one referred to, in anticipation, in I Cor. 16:4 and Rom. 15:25-32? The answer here involves our considering the meaning and purpose of the offering which provided the urgent occasion of this final visit.

It is clear that when Paul wrote the fifteenth chapter of Romans, he wished he could at once take ship for Rome. He tells his readers that he has "for many years" longed to see them; and we have no difficulty in sensing the relief and pleasure with which he now recognizes that his work in Macedonia, Greece, Asia, and elsewhere to the east is in a condition which permits his fulfilling this longtime desire. He cannot go immediately, however; he must deliver in Jerusalem the money which for some time—perhaps as long as two or three years—he has been engaged in raising among his Gentile churches for the poor of the Jerusalem church. I Cor. 16:3-4 lets us see that Paul has hoped to avoid this journey and the consequent postponement of his voyage to Rome; he speaks there of his *sending* "those whom you accredit by letter to carry your gift to Jerusalem." Even then, however, he recognizes that he may have to go with them: "If it seems advisable that I go also, they will accompany me." Rom. 15:31-32 tells us that Paul's reluctance to go to Jerusalem is caused not only by his dislike of postponing by many months his visit to Rome but also by his awareness that this trip to Jerusalem involves real danger; he asks that his readers "strive together with me in your prayers to God on my behalf, that I may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judea." (We have already noted that the Acts story of what happened in Jerusalem is fully in line with these forebodings.) But in spite of all this, Paul decides that he cannot avoid this trip. He *must* go.

Why did Paul feel under this great obligation? Why did he feel that he had to go to Jerusalem in spite of the possible loss of his liberty or his life and the certain delay in carrying out a cherished purpose? There can be but one answer to that question—the great symbolic significance of the offering he has just raised. This is at least hinted in Rom. 15:31*b*, where Paul asks the Roman church to pray that the "service for Jerusalem may be acceptable

to the saints." He can hardly feel such great anxiety that the offering be simply accepted; what he wants is that it be accepted with full and cordial recognition of its significance. That significance is clear: he hopes that this offering will have the effect of bringing peace to the church, of healing the terrible schism between Jerusalem and the Gentile churches (at least *his* churches) which has distressed him and has embarrassed and impeded his work for a long time.

Now the only other place (that is, besides I and II Corinthians and Romans) in Paul's letters where a collection for Jerusalem is mentioned is Gal. 2:1-10. There Paul is describing his conference with the leaders of the Jerusalem church over this same issue and how it might be settled. He tells us that this conference ended with James, Cephas, and John acknowledging his apostleship and his authority among the Gentile churches and stipulating only that Paul and his churches should "remember the poor" (obviously the poor of the Jerusalem church); "which very thing," Paul adds, "I was eager to do."

There are three, and only three, ways in which this stipulation can be understood. (a) The first is as a reference to a regular, more or less constant, effort on Paul's part to raise and send money to Jerusalem, which he is now asked to continue, and which he expresses himself as eager to do. (b) The second is as a reference to some special collection for Jerusalem which antedates the offering being raised in the period of the Corinthian letters. (c) The third is as a reference to this offering. There are no other alternatives; let us consider these.

The first of them is usually chosen: the passage is taken to refer to a common practice of the apostle and the Gentile churches. But there is absolutely no evidence of the existence of such a practice in the letters or, for that matter, in Acts. The only mention of a collection in Acts is at 11:29-30, where we are told that the church at Antioch sent a gift to the church in Judea. But the story of this offering does not suggest a common practice; indeed, quite the reverse, since Luke indicates that it was made under very extraordinary circumstances, as the consequence of a special prediction by a prophet named Agabus that "there would be a great famine over all the world." There is, of course, plenty of evidence in Paul's letters that the churches were expected to care for their poor. II Thess. 3:10 reflects the practice of assisting the needy from a common fund, as do Rom. 12:13 and passages in other letters also. But such passages cannot be cited to prove that there was a custom of sending money to *Jerusalem*.

Sometimes the tense of the word "remember" is cited as supporting this view. That tense is the present, the tense of continuous action. Ernest DeWitt Burton, surely an authority on such a point, writes: "The tense of *μνημονεύωμεν*, denoting continued action, indicates either that the course of action referred to is one which having already been begun is to be continued, or that there is distinctly in mind a practice (not a single instance) of it in the future." Although Burton regards the former of the two meanings as "somewhat more probable," it is not clear that he does so on merely linguistic grounds; in any case, there is nothing whatever against the second.

And that meaning is quite compatible with *c*, since the offering referred to in Corinthians and Romans was in process of being taken for two years at least, and Galatians, according to the usual dating, was written while it was in progress. Note also that I Cor. 16:2 directs: "On the first day of every week, each of you is to put something aside and save, as he may prosper, so that contributions need not be made when I come." In an allusion to such a collection, especially if the allusion is made while the collection is being taken, the present tense of "remember" would be almost required. Besides, is it not likely that Paul thought of the offering he was taking in the period of the Corinthian letters as the beginning of a practice? Surely it is more probable that such was Paul's expectation after the offering should be taken than that it had been his practice before, in view of the lack of any reference to it in his letters.

But if it should be decided that the present tense of "remember" looks—be it ever so slightly—in the direction of a long-standing practice, the aorist ἐσπούδασα (I made haste) looks much more decisively in the direction of a single effort. "The verb," says Burton, "signifies not simply, 'to be willing,' nor, on the other hand, 'to do with eagerness,' but 'to make diligent effort' to do a thing. . . . ; cf. Jth. 13:1, 12, 'to make haste' to do a thing. Apparently, therefore, it can not refer simply to the apostle's state of mind, but either to a previous or subsequent activity on his part." Note that the reference is to *an activity* in particular, not to habitual activity. A "previous activity" is ruled out as a possibility in this case by the fact, which Burton notes, that the sentence here constitutes a stipulation in a contract, "a qualification of an agreement." But such a "qualification" has no reality if it has already been fulfilled. The "diligent effort" to which Paul refers, then, must have taken place after the conference.

But when? Was it (*b*) an effort made and consummated, of which no mention is made in Paul's letters or in any other source and of which all trace has been lost; or was it (*c*) the effort of which we read so much in I and II Corinthians and Romans? In favor of *c* is the fact that Paul's references to the collection in these letters are such as to suggest, neither a recognized custom nor an activity with a precedent, but a unique undertaking. Paul nowhere appeals either to a previous practice or to a previous effort. In writing to the Romans he not only has to inform them that an offering has been taken, but he even has to explain why it is appropriate. No, everything suggests that when the Jerusalem leaders proposed that the Gentile churches in Paul's territory should "remember the poor," they were proposing a new thing. Paul saw in this proposal a real opportunity to solve the problem which had brought him to Jerusalem on this occasion, and he immediately set out to raise as large a sum as possible. It was because the offering had been undertaken under these circumstances and had this potential meaning that Paul felt he must at all costs carry it himself to Jerusalem. He must dramatize and make fully effective its significance as a peace offering on the part of the Gentile churches, of which he was the head and the symbol.

This connection between Gal. 2:10 and Rom. 15:25-32 is recognized by C. H. Dodd when he writes: "Paul does not add [to what he says in Rom. 15] that for him it was not only a moral obligation, but a contractual one, in view of his agreement with Peter, James, and John." A. D. Nock states it equally clearly when, speaking of the period of the Corinthian letters, he writes: "The only bond between [Paul] and Jerusalem now is his collection of money for the benefit of the community there: he had promised that, and he would keep his part of the bargain." That Nock is identifying this collection with the special one referred to in the Corinthian letters and in Romans appears unmistakably when he writes in another connection: "From this center [Ephesus] Paul was to organize his collection for the benefit of the church at Jerusalem." And William Sanday and Arthur Headlam come close to implying the same connection when they allude to the offering as "the peace-offering of the Gentile Churches."

But what Dodd, Nock, and many others apparently do not recognize is that to bring the offering of Corinthians-Romans into this kind of connection with Gal. 2:10 is to bring the visit to Jerusalem, which occurred "fourteen years later" (V in the outline), and the visit to convey the offering (VII) very close together. We cannot very well suppose that Paul got around to fulfilling his "contractual obligation" some ten years or so after the contract was made. The effort to raise the collection occupied perhaps as much as two years (cf. II Cor. 9:2), but surely not much longer. An interval of not more than three years is indicated between the "conference" and the "offering" visits almost as clearly and surely as though Paul had said again, "after three years. . . ."

This means, of course, that when Paul made his visit to Jerusalem "fourteen years later," he had reached the zenith of his career. He had labored in Galatia and Asia, in Macedonia and Greece. It is true that he does not mention these various fields in Gal. 1:21. But there is not the slightest reason why he should. He says, "Then I went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia"; but instead of going on to indicate where else he went, he returns his attention immediately to the point which alone was relevant: "I was still not known by sight to the churches of Christ in Judea." What was important in the argument was that he left Judea after his two-weeks visit; there was no occasion whatever for a description of all his subsequent activities. When he resumes, "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem," he gives no indication of where he has been meanwhile, or of where he was when he began his journey. Johannes Weiss, although he is applying this point quite differently, makes it clearly when he writes: "Gal. 1:21 cannot be taken to mean that for the fourteen years, he worked *only* in Syria and Cilicia. The statement merely indicates the point from which his work at that time began, but does not in any way describe this work as a whole." That Paul had reached Macedonia, Greece, and Asia at the time of this "conference" visit is in some degree confirmed, however, by his statement that he took Titus with him, since Titus is not mentioned except in the Corinthian letters. If it should be objected that Barnabas went also, and that Barnabas, and Mark, broke with Paul much earlier in his career, we need

only note that our only evidence that this break occurred earlier is in Acts. If Paul alludes to a break at all, he does so in Gal. 2:13, in what is apparently a sequel to the conference. (In Acts, too, the rupture with Barnabas occurs only after this conference.) If the conference, therefore, took place only a few years before the final visit, the disagreement with Barnabas cannot be dated earlier. We are bound also to notice the references to Barnabas in I Cor. 9:6 and to Barnabas and Mark in Col. 4:10. It is likely that these two men were known in both Corinth and Colossae.

If, then, we had only the letters of Paul, we should undoubtedly have something like the following understanding of the course of Paul's career after his conversion: He remained in the neighborhood of Damascus for three years or more. After a visit to Jerusalem to become acquainted with Cephas, he returned to Syria (probably to Antioch), then went on (probably soon afterward) to Cilicia. In the course of the next fourteen, or perhaps eleven, years he lived and worked in Galatia, Macedonia, Greece, and Asia, and possibly elsewhere. He ran into increasing difficulty with conservative Jewish Christians, probably from Judea, and finally went to Jerusalem to talk with the leaders there about the growing rift. This conference ended, as we have seen, with their giving him the right hand of fellowship, but with the stipulation of aid for the poor. This aid Paul set about raising. In Romans we see him, the collection completed, ready to embark for Jerusalem to deliver it but apprehensive as to what will happen there.

.....
We are now in position to attempt something a little more systematic in the way of a chronological reconstruction of Paul's career. . . .

.....
We have already examined the reasons for believing that Paul's conversion, which suddenly turned the persecutor into the apostle, should be dated not earlier than A.D. 34 or 35.

Paul tells us that immediately after this transforming experience he went to Arabia, the country just to the east and south of Syria. The border was close to Damascus; indeed it has sometimes been held that in or about this period Damascus belonged to Arabia rather than to Syria. We do not know where Paul went in Arabia nor why. The only reasons it is usually supposed that he went for solitude and meditation are, first, that he says he "did not confer with flesh and blood" and, second, that the word "Arabia" means to us deserts and the solitary life. The second of these reasons has no force at all, and the first hardly more. There were cities in Arabia, and there is no reason to suppose Paul did not visit one of them. But we do not know where or why he went. Nor do we know how long he stayed in Arabia. We are told only that he returned to Damascus and three years later went to Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion. It is impossible to tell whether the "three years" are computed from the time of the conversion or from the time of his return to Damascus. Thus we may say that Paul's visit to Jerusalem to become acquainted with Cephas did not take place earlier than A.D. 37 or 38 and may have happened as late as A.D. 40,

The next visit of Paul to Jerusalem, "fourteen years later," would appear at first to be even more difficult to date with any assurance, since again we cannot tell whether this interval falls between the two visits or between the conversion and the second visit. Most critics hold that the language points more naturally to fourteen years from the first visit. If this is what Paul means, the second visit occurred somewhere between A.D. 50 or 51 and A.D. 53 or 54. On the other hand the possibility that he means fourteen years from the conversion must not be forgotten; if so, the limits are A.D. 48 or 49 and A.D. 51 or 52. Thus, allowing for doubt on this point as well as for our uncertainty about the date of the conversion, we have as possible outside limits of the second visit the dates A.D. 48 and 54.

We can considerably narrow these limits, however, if we adopt A.D. 55 as the date of Festus' accession. If we accept also Luke's statement that Paul reached Jerusalem on his final visit well before this accession (Acts 24:27 seems to say "two years" before), that last journey can be dated in or near A.D. 54. Since, as we have seen, an interval of not more than two or three years can be allowed between the second, or conference, visit, when responsibility for the offering was accepted, and the final visit, when the offering was actually delivered, the date of this second visit could not be far from A.D. 51 or 52. This means that if Paul intends in Gal. 2:1 to indicate an interval of approximately seventeen years between his conversion and this second visit, the conversion occurred in A.D. 34 or 35; if he intends an over-all interval of only fourteen years, it occurred in A.D. 37 or 38.

How Paul passed the fourteen years, or perhaps eleven, which immediately preceded the conference visit is, in general, quite clear. He passed it in doing the major part of the work for which he is known. When he went down to Jerusalem on his first visit, "three years after," he had worked only in Syria (that is, around Damascus) and possibly in Arabia. When he went down again, "fourteen years later," he had labored in the provinces of Galatia and Asia in Asia Minor and throughout Macedonia and Greece. We know this because the Corinthian letters, quite obviously written immediately after the conference visit, clearly presuppose Paul's work in all of these areas. Paul tells us explicitly that he passed the earliest part of this period in Syria and Cilicia, and we may surmise that he did some evangelistic work in those territories, but he does not say so. There is every indication, however, that the major part of his work in this fourteen-year period was done in the areas farther west. Only that part of his work is reflected in his letters.

We have good reason to trust the Acts account of the general order in which this work was done. According to that account he went first to Galatia, then to Macedonia, down the Greek peninsula, and finally to Ephesus and Asia. The letters nowhere contradict, and often confirm, this story. Since Galatia is the easternmost of the provinces mentioned, it is to be assumed that he would work there first. I Thessalonians tells us clearly that when Paul first came to Thessalonica he had been in Philippi (2:2), and that when he left Thessalonica it was to go in the direction of Athens (3:1). Clearly he was moving down the peninsula and would eventually reach Corinth, as Acts says he did. As for Ephesus, the letters themselves give us

no hint as to when Paul first reached the city. There is nothing inherently unlikely in his having worked in Asia before going on to Greece and Macedonia; but Acts says definitely that he did not do so (16:6), and there is not the slightest contradictory evidence in the letters. The fact that the Acts story of the general direction of Paul's work is confirmed from Philippi to Corinth creates the presumption that Luke is correct about Ephesus too.

It is likely that, having reached Ephesus in a succession of moves (not one "journey") which may well have taken five or six years or longer, Paul made the city his headquarters for his further work. . . .

Except for the conference, the final visit to Corinth by way of Macedonia which is recorded for us in both the letters and Acts, the last journey to Jerusalem, and occasional episodes described in the book of Acts which there is no reason to distrust, we cannot reconstruct the activities of Paul during these busy years. There are in various letters hints of, or explicit references to, visits to churches which neither Acts nor other allusions in the letters permit us to fit into any comprehensive pattern. Paul's words in II Cor. 11:23-28 vividly remind us of how little we would know even if we could accept the entire Acts story without reservation. . . .

We have seen that the "silent" years do not need to be allowed for. The scheme at which we arrive if we follow the evidence of the letters is somewhat as follows:

Conversion (depending upon how we interpret "fourteen years")	A.D. 34 or 37
First visit to Jerusalem ("three years later")	37 or 40
Evangelistic activity in Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Macedonia, Greece, and Asia (possibly elsewhere)	37 or 40 to 51
Second visit to Jerusalem (conference)	51
Taking of offering and other evangelistic activity in Asia Minor and Greece	51 to 53
Final visit to Jerusalem to take the offering; the arrest there	53 or 54

THE MARTYRDOM OF PAUL AND PETER

Jack Finegan

ACCORDING to tradition which goes back at least to the fifth century, the Mamertine prison is the place where both Paul and Peter were confined before their execution under Nero. Whether this is correct or not is difficult to determine, but the fact is certain that the two great apostles suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero. In the case of Paul, the last statement of the book of Acts is that he abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling in Rome, preaching freely to all who came to him (Acts 28:30 f.). Whether his martyrdom followed at the close of these two years, as the further silence of Acts might seem to imply, cannot now be said with certainty. Perhaps he was set free at the expiration of that period and enabled to achieve his cherished purpose of preaching in Spain (Romans 15:24, 28), before eventually suffering death in Rome. In the case of Peter there is a veiled reference to his death in John 21:18: "when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not."

Then, before the end of the first century we find a writer at Rome referring at some length to the impressive example set by Peter and Paul in their martyrdom. The passage is to be found in a letter which Clement, the bishop of Rome (A.D. c. 88-c. 97), wrote to the Corinthians around A.D. 95. Since there was disharmony in the Corinthian church which had its roots in envy and jealousy, Clement pictured the evil results which had followed upon such attitudes both in ancient and in recent times. As a recent illustration, he cited the persecution and martyrdom of Peter and Paul. Clement said:

But to leave the ancient examples, let us come to the champions who lived nearest our times; let us take the noble examples of our generation. On account of jealousy and envy the greatest and most righteous pillars of the church were persecuted, and contended even unto death. Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles: Peter, who on account of unrighteous jealousy endured not one nor two, but many sufferings, and so having borne his testimony, went to his deserved place of glory. On account of jealousy and strife Paul pointed out the prize of endurance. After he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had been a preacher in the East and in the West, he received the noble reward of his faith; having taught righteousness unto the whole world, and having come to the farthest bounds of the West, and having borne witness before rulers, he thus departed from the world and went unto the holy place, having become a notable pattern of patient endurance.

From *Light from the Ancient Past*, Princeton, 1946, pp. 297-304. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Princeton University Press.

Clement then proceeded immediately to group with Peter and Paul a large number of Christians, including both men and women, who were persecuted fiendishly and put to death:

Unto these men who lived lives of holiness was gathered a vast multitude of the elect, who by many indignities and tortures, being the victims of jealousy, set the finest examples among us. On account of jealousy women, when they had been persecuted as Danaïds and Dircae, and had suffered cruel and unholy insults, safely reached the goal in the race of faith and received a noble reward, feeble though they were in body.

That is an unmistakable reference to the persecution of the Christians at Rome by Nero, as it is more fully known to us through the Roman historian Tacitus (A.D. c. 55-c. 117). Although Tacitus was not an eyewitness of the persecution, he had very good opportunities for obtaining accurate information and his account is regarded as entirely trustworthy. In the fifteenth book of his *Annals* he tells of the terrible conflagration which broke out at Rome on the eighteenth day of July in the year 64. Raging for six days and driven by the wind, the fire swept irresistibly through the labyrinth of Roman streets and when finally it was stopped only four of the city's fourteen districts were standing entire. Whether the fire started accidentally or was set deliberately by Nero, public suspicion turned upon the emperor as its instigator. Thereupon Nero cast the blame upon the hated Christians and subjected them to the most atrocious tortures. This persecution is described vividly by Tacitus:

Nero put in his own place as culprits, and punished with most ingenious cruelty, men whom the common people hated for their shameful crimes and called Christians. Christ, from whom the name was derived, had been put to death in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator Pontius Pilate. The deadly superstition, having been checked for awhile, began to break out again, not only throughout Judea, where this mischief first arose, but also at Rome, where from all sides all things scandalous and shameful meet and become fashionable. Therefore, at the beginning, some were seized who made confessions; then, on their information, a vast multitude was convicted, not so much of arson as of hatred of the human race. And they were not only put to death, but subjected to insults, in that they were either dressed up in the skins of wild beasts and perished by the cruel mangling of dogs, or else put on crosses to be set on fire, and, as day declined, to be burned, being used as light by night. Nero had thrown open his gardens for that spectacle, and gave a circus play, mingling with the people dressed in a charioteer's costume or driving in a chariot. From this arose, however, toward men who were, indeed, criminals and deserving extreme penalties, sympathy, on the ground that they were destroyed not for the public good, but to satisfy the cruelty of an individual.

This description by Tacitus agrees remarkably well with the intimations of Clement's letter and fills out the details of the indignities and tortures heaped upon the Christians at Nero's circus play. Both accounts evidently refer to the same events, and the close agreement between Tacitus and Clement is strong reason for regarding the year 64 as the date of the death of the two great apostles.

Around A.D. 200 Tertullian likewise refers to the death of Peter and Paul as having taken place at Rome under Nero and correctly interprets

John 21:18 as a reference to Peter's crucifixion: "At Rome Nero was the first who stained with blood the rising faith. Then is Peter girt by another, when he is made fast to the cross. Then does Paul obtain a birth suited to Roman citizenship, when in Rome he springs to life again ennobled by martyrdom." On another occasion Tertullian incidentally indicates the manner of both martyrdoms by comparing the death of Peter to that of Jesus and the death of Paul to that of John the Baptist: "How happy is its church, on which apostles poured forth all their doctrine along with their blood! Where Peter endures a passion like his Lord's! where Paul wins his crown in a death like John's!"

Also Eusebius relates in his *Church History* that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom at about the same time in Rome under Nero. The *Church History* was published in A.D. 326, but Eusebius derived his information in this regard from authorities who had lived much earlier. He cites Caius, who probably lived in Rome in the time of Pope Zephyrinus about A.D. 199-217, and Dionysius, who was bishop of Corinth at the same time that Soter was bishop of Rome around A.D. 166-174. The entire passage, with the quotations from the two earlier sources, is as follows:

When the government of Nero was now firmly established, he began to plunge into unholy pursuits, and armed himself even against the religion of the God of the universe. . . . He was the first of the emperors who showed himself an enemy of the divine religion. The Roman Tertullian is likewise a witness of this. He writes as follows: "Examine your records. There you will find that Nero was the first that persecuted this doctrine, particularly then when after subduing all the east, he exercised his cruelty against all at Rome. We glory in having such a man the leader in our punishment. For whoever knows him can understand that nothing was condemned by Nero unless it was something of great excellence." Thus publicly announcing himself as the first among God's chief enemies, he was led on to the slaughter of the apostles. It is, therefore, recorded that Paul was beheaded in Rome itself, and that Peter likewise was crucified under Nero. This account of Peter and Paul is substantiated by the fact that their names are preserved in the cemeteries of that place even to the present day. It is confirmed likewise by Caius, a member of the Church, who arose under Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome. He, in a published disputation with Proclus, the leader of the Phrygian heresy, speaks as follows concerning the places where the sacred corpses of the aforesaid apostles are laid: "But I can show the trophies of the apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian way, you will find the trophies of those who laid the foundations of this church." And that they both suffered martyrdom at the same time is stated by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in his epistle to the Romans, in the following words: "You have thus by such an admonition bound together the planting of Peter and of Paul at Rome and Corinth. For both of them planted and likewise taught us in our Corinth. And they taught together in like manner in Italy, and suffered martyrdom at the same time."

This passage in Eusebius is of particular interest because of the quotation which it contains from Caius. As a presbyter in the Roman church at the beginning of the third century, he was involved in a disputation with Proclus, the leader of the sect of the Montanists. As is evident from a later passage in the *Church History*, Proclus had supported his position by an appeal to the existence of the tombs of Philip and his four daughters at Hierapolis in Asia. This latter passage reads: "And in the Dialogue of Caius

which we mentioned a little above, Proclus, against whom he directed his disputation, in agreement with what has been quoted, speaks thus concerning the death of Philip and his daughters: 'After him there were four prophetesses, the daughters of Philip, at Hierapolis in Asia. Their tomb is there and the tomb of their father.'

Over against the claims of Proclus, Caius appealed to the existence in Rome of the glorious last resting places of Peter and Paul, who had taught there and laid the foundations of the Roman church. "But," said he in reply to Proclus, "I can show the trophies of the apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian way, you will find the trophies of those who laid the foundations of this church." The Greek word "trophy" which is used here, originally meant the memorial of a victory which was raised on the field of battle. Thus, for example, the armor or weapons of the defeated enemy might be fixed to a tree or upright post, with an accompanying inscription and dedication. In similar fashion when a Christian hero fell on the field of martyrdom, his grave appropriately enough might be referred to as a "trophy."

The Vatican, to which Caius referred as the place of the tomb of Peter, was the Ager Vaticanus, where "Nero's Circus" and "Nero's Gardens" were, and where so many other Christians also perished in Nero's frightful exhibition of cruelty. There on the outskirts of Nero's Circus, as near as possible to the place of his triumph in death, was the grave of Peter. According to the first chapter of the *Liber Pontificalis* the exact location was between the Via Aurelia and the Via Triumphalis, near a temple of Cybele which by popular error was later called a shrine of Apollo.

The Ostian Way, to which Caius referred as the place of the tomb of Paul, was the ancient Via Ostiensis. This road led from Rome to the port city of Ostia, some fourteen miles distant at the mouth of the Tiber. It departed from the southern side of Rome at a point some distance west of the Via Appia by which Paul had first entered the city. As Paul was led forth to die his eyes must have fallen upon one monument which still stands today upon the Via Ostiense. This is the Pyramid of Cestius at the present Porta San Paolo. It was a tomb which was erected in Egyptian pyramidal form for a certain Caius Cestius Epulo who died before 12 B.C. One hundred and sixteen feet high and covered with marble slabs, the pyramid was enclosed by Aurelian within his city wall but extricated in 1660 by Pope Alexander VII, and looms up today exactly as it did when Paul passed. The last resting place of the great apostle was some one and one-quarter miles farther out the Via Ostiensis.

Thus, as Caius is witness, the graves of Peter and of Paul at the Vatican and on the Ostian Way respectively, were perfectly well-known martyr-memorials in Rome around A.D. 200. Nor could these graves have been recent inventions of pious credulity as if they first had been arbitrarily "discovered" say around A.D. 170. By that time the Christian custom of burial in the catacombs was fully established, and if one had wished to invent the graves of Peter and of Paul it would have been most natural to place them in or near some of these recognized Christian cemeteries

where undisturbed veneration of the holy places would have been possible. Instead both graves are remote from all Christian cemeteries and in fact lie amidst pagan cemeteries of the first and second centuries. This fact has been established by recent excavations which have revealed pagan columbaria in the immediate neighborhood of the graves of both Peter and Paul. No one would have "invented" the holy graves in such unholy surroundings.

In the light of history it is eminently fitting that Peter's grave should be hard by Nero's Circus to proclaim that the tyrant's triumph was transient but the apostle's was everlasting. And it is likewise appropriate that Paul who had traveled so far for Christ should be buried at last beside a highway as if to signify that his strong heart was still eager for the preaching of the gospel in distant places. Both graves are truly trophies of victory.

Part III

THE LETTERS OF PAUL

PAUL AS A LETTER WRITER

Martin Dibelius

PAUL, THE GREATEST apostle, was also the greatest author of primitive Christianity. But he had no intention of being an author; his literary remains consist not of books but of genuine letters, although, apart from Philemon, they are not private letters. His place in literature is made plain by the fact that frequently his letters ascend from the immediate subject matter to become something of general validity in the manner of a sermon, and also by the fact that the intimacy of the correspondence is not lost. This is seen especially in the personal tone of the expressions they use and also in that they deal with the requirements of the people addressed.

In outer framework Paul follows the epistolary style of his times, though not without himself changing what he found at hand. A Greek private letter begins with a prescript: "(the sender) gives (his) greetings to (the recipient)." Paul employs this formula, but instead of the Greek greeting *charein* (salutation) he employs the similar sounding but far deeper *charis* (grace) and adds the Semitic greeting "peace," e.g. "Grace and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." This combination of words of greeting had possibly already become customary in Greek-speaking Judaism, but it may originate with Paul. Sometimes two or three writers are named, a feature which springs from the apostle's desire to let his fellow-workers express themselves, but it is no indication that they took part in composing the letter. Even such a personal writing as 2 Cor. bears two names at the head. Again, when Paul writes in the first person plural, this is not to be connected with any plurality in the prescript. Sometimes he meant thereby Christians in general, sometimes the apostles and the missionaries, but usually himself, in which case the "we" is the well-known plural of authorship (cf. 1 Thess. iii, 1 with iii, 5). Frequently in a Greek private letter, an assurance of prayer for the recipients follows on a prescript. Characteristically in Paul an expression of thanks grew out of this feature; when he mentions his readers his prayer is one of thanksgiving. That is the form in which Paul gives praise to his churches. When he departs from this form, as in Galatians: "I marvel that you are so soon removed" as we read in this case, we can see that he consciously departed from custom and thereby sharply censured them. The proem, which as a rule is introduced by the expression of thanks, only plays upon the relations of Paul to the church. Thus in 1 Cor. the matter dealt with is the "knowledge" of the church but not the dangers arising therefrom. In the

proem of Romans the subject is the visit to Rome, but not the further journey to Spain.

In most of his letters, before the real conclusion with greetings and blessings, Paul writes an "exhortation." This is an almost unordered sequence of various individual exhortations which have no relation with the church concerned; rather we find here a piece of Christian tradition which Paul passes on both in preaching and similarly also in his letters. The schematic, but not the topical, character of the exhortations has frequently been misunderstood, and in error all the sins about which the readers are now exhorted have been ascribed to particular churches. Of course, Paul did in fact vary these rules; yet he did not invent them, but only passed them on, doing so indeed in the course of his missionary work. That they are not his spiritual property to the same degree as the rest of the contents of his letters is to be seen by a comparison of the hortatory sections of the Pauline epistles with those in James, 1 Peter, and Hebrews xiii. The style of the proverb is made use of in all these sections, among which we may, and indeed must, compare those containing the "household lists" in Col., Eph., and 1 Peter. That Paul was partial to giving such instruction in the course of missionary preaching may be inferred from 1 Thess. iv, 1, 2: the readers have received from him exhortations of this character and corrected themselves accordingly, and he now purposes to exhort them to closer conformity in order "that ye abound more and more . . ." and then a brief exhortation follows. Probably in Romans vi, 17 similar missionary work is being done in a church which Paul has not himself founded. According to 1 Cor. iv, 17 it would seem that Timothy, on a sort of journey of inspection, was intended to remind the Corinthians of the exhortations (literally "ways that be in Christ") which Paul was accustomed to give "everywhere in every church."

A large number of Pauline letters appear to have been dictated. Frequently the remark "My greetings with my own, Paul's, hand," at the end of the letter, shows that Paul has himself taken the pen from the hand of the amanuensis who has hitherto been wielding it. On one occasion, Romans xvi, 22, this amanuensis interpolates his own greeting. Indications of remarks written by Paul himself are to be found in 1 Cor. xvi, 21; Col. iv, 18; and 2 Thess. iii, 17. Probably Gal. vi, 11 is also to be understood in this way. This custom of Paul's (of dictating) is not without significance for the style of his letters. In reading them we must bear in mind that Paul usually, perhaps always, spoke these sentences aloud, and that they were intended to be read aloud in the assembly of the church. This fact conditions, e.g., the formulas of the prayers with which Paul occasionally concludes a passage (Rom. xi, 36; xv, 6; 2 Cor. ix, 15; 1 Thess. iii, 11-13). Hence the kernel of the letters to the churches consists of a speech by the Apostle; according to the degree of intimacy between Paul and the readers this speech is sometimes more in the nature of a sermon, sometimes more in that of an address and discussion.

Thus in many respects the style of the Pauline letters is that of spoken language, the characteristic formlessness of which can be traced in Paul's

writings, e.g. in the interjected corrections of himself (as in 1 Cor. i, 16), in incomplete sentences (Rom. v, 12), and in the heaping up of pointed expressions (e.g. Col. ii, 20-3) the reference of which was comprehensible to the readers, but which we should only be able to explain with complete certainty if we knew the tone and gestures employed by Paul when he dictated. But there was not lacking the conventional correctness which was to be found in any case in public speech in Greek (even in the case of the person who despised the artificialities of technical rhetoric): puns, rhyme in enumerations, rhythm in exalted passages, parallelism, addresses to fictitious persons (Rom. ii, 1, 17), scoldings (e.g. 1 Cor. xv, 36, at the same time addressed to an unknown opponent), antitheses (2 Cor. vi, 14), and *provisos* which conclude the sentence (Phil. i, 11; ii, 11), are all to be found in Paul. He had probably made the acquaintance of these features to a large extent in the speech of Greek Judaism. In any case, things of this nature might be heard from the Cynic itinerant preachers in the street. Thus we must always keep it in mind that Paul entered upon a tradition; many of his metaphors, e.g. those of the racecourse, have scarcely come from personal observation, but probably from the literary heritage. Again certain details in the language dealing with worship point back to the synagogue. The strikingly long constructions found in Col. i, 12-20 and 2 Thess. i, 3-10 are to be explained by supposing that in both cases Jewish formulas had been transposed to Christ and the Christians, and correspondingly extended by Christianizing additions.

But even in what is Paul's own creation we must differentiate between the purely epistolary discussions built up for the purpose of the correspondence, and other sections whose fixed formulation and irrelevant content show that they had been modelled at an earlier date by Paul independently of the particular letter in which they now occur, and probably for the purpose of his own preaching. The best known example of such interpolations is the "Hymn of Love" (1 Cor. xiii), and also the celebrated passage about Christ (Phil. ii, 5-11), which stands in the middle of an exhortation to humility. We may notice in passing that the interpolation of dissertations on favourite themes is common in the popular philosophy of the Cynics and Stoics. Paul could, therefore, reckon on the understanding of his readers if he interrupted the connection in a similar fashion.

Another reason for such interruptions was afforded by the liking of the earlier Jewish scribes for biblical exegesis. Paul adds such a "midrash," i.e. an exegetical proof in Rabbinic style, as an appendix to a discussion as in Gal. iv, 21-31 and Rom. xv, 7-12, or he even interweaves it into his propositions, as in Gal. iii, 10-13. Such passages are at the same time a proof of the way in which Paul drew his conclusions from various sayings of the Old Testament which were bound together by association in a manner corresponding to the Jewish technique. Of quite another kind, and much more significant of what was original in Paul, are his personal confessions which are occasioned by questions or by attacks on his own concerns or attitudes; these draw him aside from the continuation of his line of thought. Such features enable us to see into the heart of Paul as into that of few men

of ancient times. An example, slight in scope but of inner significance, is offered by Phil. iii, 2-16, where the warning against the circumcisers occasions a word in regard to true circumcision and true glorying. This warning breaks into the continuation of the exhortation (*vide* iv, 1) which had been begun in iii, 1. More detailed and much more important is the great confession (2 Cor. iii-vi) which is interpolated into the narrative of Paul's experiences, i.e. between ii, 12 ff. and vii, 5 ff. Sometimes in language enlivened with emotion, sometimes in language which is closely connected with a definite form by the sacred character of the subject, we find described the apostle's consciousness of being sent, i.e. he belongs to the kingdom of eternity but is under obligation to labour and suffer on earth.

It is exactly in such a passage that one can see in what Paul's art as an author consists. On the one hand it consists in connecting the personal element with practical matters. Thus if he is attacked, as in Corinthians or Galatians, his response becomes a defence of the gospel. If he wishes to express thanks or to give an item of news without attention to style, as in 1 Thessalonians or Philippians, he does so, as he himself would say, "in Christ," i.e. every human and personal interest is made subordinate to that of his message—his observations on life and death in Phil. i, 12-26, and the report of his experience interfused with references to his work as in 1 Thess. ii, 17-iii, 10; 2 Cor. ii, 5-17 and vii, 5-16 are cases in point. If his purpose is to introduce himself to a church where he is not personally known, as in Romans, he speaks not of himself but of the message he will bring. The only passage in this letter which deals with an open question in the church to which it was sent, is the section dealing with vegetarians among the Roman Christians (Romans xiv, 1-xv, 13).

Moreover, further examination of this section shows still another peculiarity of the personal style found in Paul—the fact that every incident is looked at from a higher level, no matter whether it be important or unimportant, e.g. the proceedings in Corinth, the aversion from work in Thessalonica, the runaway slave from Colossae, the quarrel of the two Christian women in Philippi, the wearing of head-dresses by women in Corinth, the vices of the heathen and the pride of the Jews, the resurrection, the righteousness of God, sacrificial meat and vegetarian diet—everything whether "spiritual" or "secular" (according to later distinctions), is important only "in Christ." Hence Paul damps his feelings where we should have expected purely human affection, as in the case of the "thankless thanks" for monetary assistance in Philippians iv, 10-20. But even on material affairs he is not sparing in his words or his feelings when, as in 1 Cor. ix, by the example of his own refusal of "ministerial support," he can place before his readers the correct distinction between self-assertion and self-denial.

Again, even in individual cases the distinctions which he makes can be explained by their value from the other side, i.e. that of eternity; thus where a minority of doubtful Christians cannot yet find their feet in the consequences of their freedom from the Law, Paul desires that "weaker" brother should be borne with because Christ died even for him (Rom. xiv,

15 and 1 Cor. viii, 11). But where it is put forward as a condition of salvation, that the legal requirements should be fulfilled, as in Galatians, then Paul will make no compromise, for the new relation between men and God brought into the world by Christ is now in danger. This relation knows nothing of human accomplishment before God but only of faith in God's grace. Moreover these are the most powerful and audacious expressions in the Pauline letters. Ever and again throughout the centuries, they have given Christendom occasion for self-examination. For Paul can gather into a few words the paradoxical character of the gospel, permitting of no compromise: "For God hath shut up all into disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all" (Romans xi, 32); "For Christ is the end of the law" (Romans x, 4); "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Romans xiv, 23); "If any man is in Christ he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v, 17). In such cases we see how a faith which was full of new meaning had derived regulative and perfected modes of expression from the old language.

THE STYLE AND THOUGHT OF PAUL

Arthur D. Nock

A BOOK of the end of the second century known as the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* describes the Apostle as "small in stature, baldheaded, bowlegged, of vigorous physique, with meeting eyebrows and a slightly hooked nose, full of grace." This calls up a vivid picture; but we have no reason to believe it to be true and we must be content to know Paul from his writings.

We have all been taught that the style is the man. Style in self-conscious authors, indeed, is not so much the man himself as the man in the part which he wishes to play, or to be thought to play, upon the stake of life. Less sophisticated writers, as for instance the authors of the first two Synoptic Gospels, do not assume poses. Paul is much more akin to them than to the self-conscious type: not because he was in any sense deficient either in the art of writing or in the desire to persuade and move his readers, but because of the extreme earnestness and simplicity with which his themes absorbed his attention and because of his fatherly love for his converts and eager anxiety to help them. He is anything but artless; he concludes often his discussion of a topic with a rounded and effective close, and he can attain the heights of prose, as for instance in 1 Cor. xiii. and Rom. viii. 31-9; but as we study these passages we cannot but feel that their elevation comes entirely from within. Paul clearly had a well-developed sense for rhythm, and uses effective parallelism and other forms of ornament, but he does not think of himself as a writer; he expressly disavows any such pretension (1 Cor. ii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 6).

His independence of the art of rhetoric as it was understood in his time is shown by his failure to organize the subject-matter of his letters in a methodical structure. He has his own scheme of an Epistle, which is related to the ordinary scheme of the letter as then written; but within that scheme he passes from subject to subject, with an unrestrained use of vigorous parentheses. His style with its homely, if occasionally artificial, illustrations and metaphors has one contemporary pagan counterpart, the diatribe. This was a type of popular philosophical causerie which had been crystallized as a literary form by Bion the Cynic in the third century before Christ. Like the Pauline Epistles, it was full of rhetorical questions, often brief and in rapid succession, of short imaginary dialogues, and of small illustrative anecdotes. The essential similarity lies in the fact that the diatribe, like the Epistles, was intended to produce the effect of a spoken style; both have

From *St. Paul*, New York, 1938, pp. 233-47. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Harper & Brothers.

the same loose vigour. We cannot prove that Paul had not read works of the diatribe type, though we shall see reason to form a very limited idea of his use of books, but in any case, he could be thoroughly familiar with this mode of discourse from what he heard. Cynic philosophers talked at street corners to any and all who would listen, and Paul must have heard them at times; and much of what they said would be reasonably congenial, for the Cynics attacked popular vices, and popular superstitions.

Paul's Greek is a noteworthy phenomenon. It is not literary, but at the same time it is not like the careless Greek of the popular letters which have survived on papyrus; although it resembles them in its freedom from many of the grammatical canons of the schools, it has not their helplessness and verbosity. There are no formal periods, and indeed the art of using the period was a declining one, but there is a rhetorical movement and energy which express a powerful personality that did not shrink from coining bold phrases such as Gal. ii. 7, "the Gospel of circumcision."

A single strong influence, that of the Greek Old Testament, runs through this style. I am not speaking of direct quotations. These are rare except in the long argumentative letters to Corinth, Galatia and Rome, where they serve deliberate ends: to reinforce Paul's own position against his adversaries by an appeal to the authority which they stressed so strongly, and (as is clearly true of Romans, which is above controversy, and is true in a measure of the others) to represent what had happened as something which, in God's eternal plan, had to happen and therefore must necessarily have a happy ending (Rom. xv. 4). The striking phenomenon is, rather, that there is not a paragraph in Paul's writings which does not include subconscious recollections of the Greek Old Testament just as every paragraph of *Pilgrim's Progress* echoes the King James Bible. Greek writers frequently quoted Homer and Plato, and sometimes used Homeric phrases as a literary device; but such recollections are on an infinitely smaller scale. Paul shows only the slightest acquaintance with pagan Greek literature, but he knew his Old Testament very well.

A great classical scholar, Eduard Norden, has remarked, "Paul is a writer whom I, at least, understand only with very great difficulty." Probably all classical scholars would agree. The reason is that Paul's style is full of second-hand Semitisms which come from the Greek Bible. Paul must have had some acquaintance with the Old Testament in Hebrew also and seems to see some of the original connotations which underlie the Greek as he quotes it; but the Greek version is the fact of importance.

This stylistic phenomenon corresponds to a fact of the greatest importance in the whole writing and thought of Paul and in the whole development of early Christianity. The expression is externally Hellenic, but inwardly Jewish. The proportion of born Jews within the Christian movement diminished steadily, but at the same time the Jewish scriptures remained the scriptures of the new movement before and after they had created their own supplementary scriptures, and the development of Christian thought in the century succeeding Paul's death is inextricably bound up with the history of Christian attitudes towards the Old Testament. This is the more

remarkable when we reflect that the Septuagint was a bulky and expensive book, which would correspond in cost to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* rather than to the Bible to-day. Further, it was a book which a Greek convert would have great difficulty in reading unless he had been prepared for it. In fact, the acquaintance of the community at large with the Old Testament seems probably to have turned on sermons and on the existence of anthologies of prophetic testimonies to the coming and nature of Christ. They represent the literary product of that movement of exegetical theology which we have seen beginning in the very earliest days of the life of the Church of Jerusalem.

It is well to contrast Paul with a Jew of the preceding generation, Philo. For Philo, as for Paul, the Old Testament is the supreme revelation not only of God's will for every man, but also of all the wisdom after which man was thereafter to strive. But Philo's interest in the Old Testament was principally in the Pentateuch: he makes some quotations from the prophetic books, but he is not primarily concerned with them, since he was mainly interested in the Law, which by implication contained all that man needed to know of himself and of God, and had very little interest in the possibility of the sudden establishment of a new order on earth. Further, while Philo quotes the Old Testament constantly as the ultimate authority, his style is not saturated with reminiscences of it, but is the normal philosophic Greek of the period. Philo retained the Law, while Paul rejected: but, whereas Paul interpreted it with reference to what he held to be the novel facts of the situation, Philo showed the Hellenism, which he had side by side with his essential Judaism, by relating the Law to general concepts and to psychological and metaphysical abstractions.

In conclusion we must briefly consider the old question of the relation of the teaching of Paul to the teaching of Jesus. The antithesis is patent and has often been so treated as to represent Paul as the man who spoiled a simple and beautiful Gospel by the arbitrary introduction of quarrelsome subtleties. This is a shallow view, but there is a real question. What does Paul mean when he says, "Even if we have known Christ after the flesh, we know him so now no more" (2 Cor. v. 16)? And why does he so seldom quote actual sayings of Jesus? The problem is the more pressing, since not only was there a considerable body of ethical and other sayings of Jesus in oral circulation at the time (as the sayings of Jewish teachers were regularly preserved), but also Paul himself shows a certain amount of subconscious recollection of extant sayings of Jesus. Why does he not quote them more often in writing to his converts?

He quotes sayings of Jesus with reference to eschatology and marriage, and he quotes them, just as he recalls the words spoken at the Last Supper, as sayings which possess a binding authority. He may well have quoted more sayings in his oral teaching; the Epistles are supplementary instruction on issues which arose when he was absent. On many of these it would not have been possible to quote Jesus; so, for instance, on the problem of the Law, to which Jesus had maintained an attitude of loyalty though claiming

the right to interpret it, on the problem of Gentile converts, on meats offered to idols (though we could imagine a use of Matt. xv. 17 ff.), on spiritual gifts, on the internal discipline of a Christian community and its relation to other Christian communities. Nevertheless, there is a further point. For Paul the earthly life of Jesus, however noble, is an incident in the existence of the Lord and is moreover of that order of events which preceded the Crucifixion and Resurrection. Since, as the opening of Romans says, Jesus was appointed the Son of God with power, a new world order has been initiated; its fruition will not be seen fully until the day of the Lord, but already in those who believe and who belong to Christ, it is the order of the world. The central figure under God of this new order, or rather the figure who will remain central until his work is done, is the Risen Lord, who himself, or by, or in, or as the Spirit, determines and guides in matters large and small the life of the community which is his body in the world. For Paul this guidance was objective exactly as was the memory at Jerusalem of what Jesus had said.

Paul only thrice commends the imitation of Christ: in 1 Thess. i. 6, where the virtue to be copied is that of suffering in joy, in Rom. xv. 7, "receive one another as Christ received you," and in Col. iii. 13, "even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye" (where the reference is to the Risen Lord and not to the Jesus of history); in 1 Cor. xi. 1 Paul exhorts his converts to imitate himself, as he, Paul, imitated Christ. Elsewhere Paul alludes to the voluntary poverty of Christ (2 Cor. viii. 9), that is, as in Phil. ii., to his laying aside his princely state; and in Rom. xv. 3 he expresses the same meaning by saying that Christ "pleased not himself." Normal Christian life, however, was not a matter of imitating Jesus, but was life by the Spirit in Christ.

The primitive Apostolic preaching was concerned with the death and resurrection of Jesus, with the fulfilment of prophecy in them and in the outpouring of the Spirit on the community, and with the expectation of the second Coming. The sayings of Jesus were valued from the earliest times of the movement, but their setting in the narrative framework or written Gospels was the product of an historical interest which arose at a time when the Church was an institution which had already a generation of corporate life behind it, and when the original disciples who had lived and eaten with Jesus had mostly died or grown old, and the expectation of a second coming was on the wane. Under changed conditions it was necessary not only to supply the answers to some of the questions which piety asked, but also to reinforce that piety in daily life when it was no longer lived in the first intensity. Further, the experience of Paul had shown that the free life of the Spirit had its dangers in communities which had not a background of Jewish ethical training. Paul had been compelled to formulate the rudiments of a Christian ethic; the sub-apostolic period demanded more concrete direction.

However we formulate the relation of Paul's writings to the sayings of Jesus, we must never forget that in some of the weightiest matters Paul understood and developed ideas of Jesus which were obscured and im-

perilled at Jerusalem. Freedom in face of the Law, a generous outward-turned view of humanity, a zeal to save men at the cost of correctness—these were the marks of both Jesus and Paul. Neither tolerated

All the easy speeches
That comfort cruel men.

Much of what Paul said became unintelligible, much unnecessary, to a later age. His doctrine of the Spirit had to be modified at a time when the instruction not to quench the Spirit seemed a good deal less important than the necessity of distinguishing between spirits. His concept of the body of Christ was an incidental metaphor and not a central idea as the Church became more and more a human institution in which people grew up. His opposition to the Law was replaced by the interpretation of the Old Testament, or the moral code thereof, which he himself began. The issue between Gentile Christianity and Judaistic Christianity ceased to be a living issue when Judaistic Christianity was a very small minority and in fact broken by the siege of Jerusalem and the accompanying dispersion. The new unity was created in which Peter and Paul could be thought the joint founders of the Roman Church, and the letters of Paul passed from being utterances of the moment to become authoritative documents themselves needing exegesis. On the face of it Paul in his lifetime had sustained many bitter defeats and the type of Christianity which prevailed seems to bear many of the features which he had opposed; nevertheless, although without Paul Christianity had reached Gentiles and would have reached more Gentiles, it is Paul more than any other man who was responsible for the fact that Christianity was not a Jewish sect but an independent body with an independent life.

[PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT]

R. V. G. Tasker

BEFORE HIS CONVERSION St. Paul supposed that the chief reflection on earth of the divine glory and the supreme revelation of God's will were to be found in the Jewish law. Given to Moses by angels' hands the law was the full and, as he supposed, the final manifestation of what man must do in order to be "in the right with God" (the meaning . . . of "justification"): and even after he had as a Christian come to see how impossible it was for sinful man to attain to such a state by striving in his own strength to obey its precepts, he still placed a high value on the Mosaic Law as the divine educator which had developed man's moral sense and quickened his conscience. The law was "holy, and just, and good" (Rom. 7:12).

In II Corinthians 3:7, 8, referring back to the narrative of Ex., ch. 34, Paul speaks of the old Mosaic system, the ministration written on stones and in letters, as "glorious," so that the children of Israel were not able to gaze upon the face of Moses because of the glory of his face, even though the glory of the Old Covenant was to pass away, and its ministration was to prove to be not unto life, but unto death. Glorious it was, but with an impermanent, partial and indirect glory. The very veil on Moses' face was a symbol of its imperfection; and Paul plays upon the symbolism of the veil by adding that as long as the Jews fail to realize the temporary character of the law, the same veil lies on their understanding every time the Scriptures are read in their synagogues, and they remain blind to that fuller revelation in Christ which alone can destroy the veil. Moses removed the veil when he stood before God on the mountain; and Paul regards this as a prophecy of the *direct* manifestation of the divine glory to be found in the crucified and risen Christ: and whenever we turn away from the law to the "Lord, who is Spirit" we have an uninterrupted vision of that glory.

As a Christian Paul did not lay aside as useless all the great knowledge of the Old Testament which he had received at the feet of Gamaliel while training himself to be a Jewish Rabbi. Rather did he "baptize into Christ" all this knowledge, seeing the whole history of Israel as incomplete apart from the redemptive work of Christ, but as lit up with fresh meaning when interpreted in the light of the final revelation in which it finds its fulfilment. How very wide of the mark was Marcion in the second century when he supposed that Paul preached that the God revealed by Jesus Christ was

From *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, Philadelphia, 1947, pp. 90-11.
Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Westminster Press.

a different God and a superior God to the God revealed in the Old Testament, because of the antithesis drawn by Paul between justification by faith and justification by works! It is significant that Marcion could only give plausibility to his arguments by leaving out from his collection of the Pauline letters not only the Pastoral Epistles, which had probably not received general recognition at the time when he wrote, but also the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, which in addition to several quotations contain the great assertion that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and consolation of the Scriptures we might lay hold of the [Messianic] hope" (Rom. 15:4); and which also state that Christ "was made a minister of circumcision for the truth of God," i.e., to carry out the promises implied in the Old Covenant, the seal of which was circumcision (Rom. 15:8).

The truth is that not only does Paul make a large number of quotations from the Old Testament, chiefly in the Epistle to the Romans and to a lesser extent in the other epistles, but he uses Old Testament analogies freely to explain essential elements in Christian truth. Sometimes his quotations are taken from the common stock of Old Testament expressions, which was drawn upon by early Christian teachers, and which may have constituted a collection of "proof-texts" or *testimonia* as they were called later. Thus in common with Jesus Himself and the writer of I Peter he speaks of the crucified and risen Jesus in the words of Isaiah, as "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence" to the Jewish people (Rom. 9:32, 33); and to him, as also to I Peter, the Christians are the new People of God, in whom the words of Hosea are fulfilled when he prophesied, "I will call that My people, which was not My people, and her beloved that was not beloved" (Rom. 9:25). But although Paul drew much from the common stock, he also drew on his own profound knowledge of the Scriptures; and his handling of them is as varied as it is interesting. To understand his use of Scripture is also to understand to no small degree his theology.

Dr. William Leonard states that it is possible to distinguish four kinds of exposition of the Scriptures in the Pauline Epistles: (1) The simple literal explanation where Paul quotes the words in their direct and obvious sense. (2) The adaptation of an Old Testament passage to a subject to which it bears in the original no obvious reference; but an adaptation which is not arbitrary, but is rather a logical deduction from what is revealed in Scripture as a whole. (3) The bringing together of passages originally separate, so that they provide a logical sequence which forms a definite chain of reasoning. (4) The finding in the details of the history of the Old Israel types which are realized fully in the Christian Dispensation.

An obvious example of the first and simple method is the series of passages, mostly from The Psalms, with which Paul clinches his argument, which is an axiom of his Christianity, that all men, Jews as well as Gentiles, are bound by the slavery of sin. He might have used similar language of his own composition to express this great truth; but he quotes the language of Scripture, because it is the Scripture of the Jews and rules out any claim on their part to be exempt from the general condemnation of man-

kind as sinners in need of redemption. So he writes in Roman 3:9-18: "I have already charged all, Jews as well as Greeks, with being under sin—as it is written,

None is righteous, no, not one;
 no one understands, no one seeks for God.
 All have swerved, one and all have gone wrong,
 no one does good, not a single one.
 Their throat is an open grave,
 they are treacherous with their tongues,
 the venom of an asp lies under their lips.
 Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness,
 their feet are swift for bloodshed,
 their ways bring destruction and calamity,
 they know nothing of the way of peace;
 there is no reverence for God before their eyes."¹

Similarly Paul finds in the Old Testament, quite literally and without any strained exegesis, the doctrine of justification by faith; for Hab. 2:4 states that "the righteous man as a result of faith shall have life," and Paul naturally deduces from this that "by the works of law shall no man be justified" (Rom. 1:17 and Gal. 3:11). The story of Abraham, moreover, teaches the same truth when it is said that "he believed in God," and his trust and confidence that God would fulfil His promises were alone sufficient to give to him the status of a righteous man in the eyes of God.

The instance which Dr. Leonard gives of the way in which Paul adapts an Old Testament passage and gives it a wider interpretation than that which it bears in the original context, is his use of the command in Deut. 25:4, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth the corn." In I Cor. 9:9 he quotes this as a Scriptural command to support the preachers of the Gospel. The words do not in themselves imply any such command. But Paul sees them in a larger context. He views them in the light of the whole of divine revelation. The injunction to care for the oxen is one of the signs of God's providential care for His creatures, a care which is not limited to the oxen. Paul argues therefore from the less to the greater; and when he poses the question, "Does God care for the oxen, or does He say it, as He undoubtedly does, for our sakes?" he does not mean to imply that God has no concern for the oxen, or that he himself is indifferent to their welfare, but rather to state what is an obvious truth of Scripture that God cares less for oxen than for men; and so the precept can legitimately be used in the light of Biblical religion as a whole as a divine command, in keeping with the words of Jesus Himself (Luke 10:7) that "the labourer is worthy of his hire," the preacher of the Gospel included.

Because the greatest acts of salvation in the Old Testament were the redemption of Israel from Egypt, the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea,

¹ From *The Bible: A New Translation*, by James Moffatt. Copyright 1935 by Harper & Brothers. Used by permission.

and the supernatural sustenance afforded by God to His people during the perilous wanderings in the wilderness, it was natural that early Christian teachers should regard the death and resurrection of Jesus as their New Testament counterpart. The sacramental means of deliverance from bondage in Egypt was the blood of the Passover lamb sprinkled on the door-posts; so at an early date Christ was thought of as the true Paschal Lamb. St. Paul, when he wishes to urge upon the Corinthian Christians that pagan standards of morality cannot be tolerated within their fellowship, and that they must purge out the old leaven (leaven being always in the Bible a symbol of what is evil), naturally reminds them of the great truth of their religion that "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us 'keep the feast.'" The present tense used in the latter verb suggests that Christians should always be keeping a Festival of Redemption, always living in the atmosphere of Easter, and always showing in their lives "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (I Cor. 5:7).

Later in the same epistle he draws out more fully a comparison between the sacramental privileges received by the Israelites of old and those received by the Christians. Some of the Corinthians, perhaps under the influence of Greek Mystery Religions, in which a sacrament was regarded as an *opus operatum*, i.e., as an end in itself, bestowing once and for all benefits which could not afterwards be withdrawn, were tempted to suppose that because they had been baptized they *could* not fall into idolatry. Paul points out that in spite of the privileges received by the Israelites in old time, because of their subsequent disobedience they forfeited their privileges and received punishment at the hands of God. It is the same God with whom the Corinthians have to deal. He is still a jealous God, who in virtue of the holiness of His nature cannot overlook or fail to punish disobedience. Paul mentions four of the divine blessings bestowed upon the Israelites: the protection of the covering cloud and the miraculous passage across the Red Sea, in both of which experiences they were "baptized into [i.e., learned to look for leadership to] Moses"; the feeding with the manna or bread from heaven; and the supernatural water from the rock, the rock being a symbol of Him who was following them with His support, namely the Christ Himself. Yet in spite of this special treatment, many of them through their disobedience were overthrown and destroyed.

This is a permanent truth for all who read the pages of Scripture to ponder. It remains an example for the New Israel of God, to which the Corinthians belong. The same sins, to which the Old Israel fell victims, are still possible even for baptized Christians. They, too, can "lust after evil things," even as the Israelites lusted for the flesh-pots of Egypt in the wilderness; they, too, can fall into idolatry, as the Israelites did when they set up the golden calf at the foot of Mount Sinai, and "the people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play"; they, too, can commit immorality as the Israelites did with the women of Moab (Num. 25:1-9); they, too, can be presumptuous, and doubt whether God can or will really support them, as were the Israelites, who, in consequence, were destroyed by serpents; and they, too, can murmur against their spiritual teachers and leaders,

as Korah and his companions murmured against Moses, and met their destruction. In other words, these stories in Exodus and Numbers are not just of historical or antiquarian interest. They contain a word of God, the same God who is God of both Old and New Covenants, who has the same horror of sin and who must punish disobedience; and they remind the Christians that the People of God are subject, *mutatis mutandis*, to the same temptations, whether they belong to the Old Israel or the New.

In this passage from I Corinthians Paul uses an Old Testament narrative as a "type" containing a permanent warning. We may now turn to consider another passage, where he uses another narrative from the story of the Old Israel to convey another warning to the people of the New. He is admonishing the Galatians to hold fast their freedom in Christ, of which certain extreme Jewish-Christians are seeking to rob them by insisting that they shall submit to circumcision and keep the Jewish law. The argument of these Judaisers, as they are usually called, was that Israel was the true People of God; therefore all Gentiles who would belong to Israel must become sons of Abraham, and be circumcised. Paul therefore goes back to the story of the birth of the two sons of Abraham, a story which he regards as containing something much more than a mere record of past events. "These things," he says, "are an allegory" (Gal. 4:4-24); by which he means that they say something else besides the bare statement of facts.

The facts were that Abraham had two sons, one born to Sarah and the other to Hagar; and the names of the two sons were Isaac and Ishmael. The circumstances of the two births, however, and the condition of the two mothers at the time of the births reveal nothing less than the contrast between the Old Covenant and the New, a contrast which consists in the difference between seeking to obtain righteousness by merit as a result of keeping the works of the law, and receiving righteousness as a free gift from God by faith. Hagar was a slave-woman; her son Ishmael was born in the ordinary course of nature; and she lived in Arabia, the country in which Mount Sinai was situated, where the Mosaic law was given. She represents then the Old Covenant, the characteristic of which was that it enslaved men to its precepts, telling them what ought to be done, but giving them no powers of doing it, for it failed altogether to touch the inner springs of human nature out of which action arises. So just as Ishmael's birth was "after the flesh," so the Jewish law was a "fleshly ordinance": and, because Jerusalem, with its temple and its routine of sacrifices, was the outward and visible embodiment of the Jewish law, Hagar can be said also to "stand for" the "Jerusalem which now is," an earthly city whose inhabitants are in bondage. Sarah, on the other hand, was a free woman; her son Isaac was born out of the ordinary course of nature, and was a child of divine promise. There was something spiritual or supernatural about his birth; and to his mother could be applied the words which Isaiah spoke later with reference to Israel in her widowhood and subsequent exaltation: "Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband." Those who belong to the New Israel are like Isaac, children of promise.

They owe their position to their acceptance of the promises of God that His grace, set forth in the atoning sacrifice of Jesus, is alone sufficient for salvation. They are therefore citizens, not of any earthly Jerusalem, but of the "Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and which is their mother."

The exegesis of St. Paul in this, and in the previous passage from I Corinthians, is not fanciful or arbitrary when once it is recognized that the Old Testament is not just history, but *sacred* history, in which the ultimate end, which God had in view during the long period of self-revelation to a particular race of people, is foreshadowed in the circumstances and events which preceded its final realization. In the Old Covenant, in other words, was prefigured the shape of things to come.

The same problem which was raised by the Judaizers in Galatia, and which St. Paul handles in his allegorical treatment of the story of the births of Isaac and Ishmael, is dealt with at length in Rom., chs. 9 to 11, which form a distinct portion of that epistle and may very well have been a previous writing of St. Paul, which he has embodied in the Epistle to the Romans. The section is not only of great theological interest and importance, but it also affords us an excellent illustration of the way in which St. Paul builds up a long sequence of logical argument by means of a chain of texts taken from the Old Testament; and it is from this point of view that we may consider briefly the first part of the argument in the ninth chapter.

The rejection of Jesus as the Christ by the great majority of the Jews was not only a cause of much suffering to Paul, who was a true and loyal son of Israel, but also raised the whole question of the validity of the Old Testament. If God had chosen Israel only that they might ultimately reject Him, had not the whole purpose of God failed? It is to the task of vindicating God's dealings in the face of such a possible charge that Paul devotes himself in these chapters. "God's word has not failed." It is true that His promises were made to Israel, and to Abraham's seed. But by "the seed of Abraham" Scripture does not mean just those in whose veins flows the blood of Abraham. The line of descent, through which the promises were to be fulfilled, was not the line of Ishmael, as Paul had already shown in the Galatian letter, but the line of Isaac. This was not because Isaac was a better man than Ishmael, but because God chose that it should be so. His divine purpose is worked out in history by a process of selection. This is shown further, when Rebecca was told at the time when twin sons were in her womb that the elder should serve the younger. The prophet Malachi later saw clearly that this process of selection *was* at work when he wrote, "Jacob I loved, and Esau I hated." God was not unjust in exercising this power of selection, because He was not passing any verdict on the character or deserts of the two men Esau and Jacob. He was exercising His sovereign right, of which He spoke to Moses, when He said, "I will have pity on whom I will have pity, and show mercy to whom I will show mercy" (Ex. 33:19). His sovereignty is also displayed when He makes those who are His enemies instruments for the manifestation of His glory. So the Scripture says with reference to Pharaoh, "For this purpose did I raise thee up that I might display My power in thee, and that My name might be published in

all the earth" (Ex. 9:16). Whom God wills, then, He hardens, and to whom He wills He shows pity. If an objector draws the conclusion from this that God cannot find fault, for no one can resist His will, St. Paul replies, using a common Biblical simile, that that would be insolence on the part of the objector, like a pot saying to the potter, "Why did you make me thus?" The illustration is not a very happy one, for, as Professor C. H. Dodd remarks: "The trouble is that a man is not a pot; he *will* ask 'Why did you make me like this?' and he will not be bludgeoned into silence. It is the weakest point in the whole epistle." The illustration serves, however, to support Paul's argument that God is not responsible to human judgement; and that being God He can act in what appears to man to be an arbitrary manner. It is not, however, he goes on to add, *really* arbitrary; for the story of His dealings with His People reveals a great tolerance with the wicked and a burning desire to bestow His blessings as widely as possible. The call of the Gentiles to be the recipients of His blessings, as set forth in the words of Hosea, "I will call that My people which is not My people, and her beloved which was not beloved" (Hos. 2:23); and the refraining from exacting full punishment on Israel for its sins, but always leaving behind, in Isaiah's expression, a "remnant which would be saved" (Isa. 10:22, 23), both point to the essential love of God underlying His dealings with humanity. Without that love the whole of Israel might have perished. For as Isaiah said, "If the Lord of Hosts had not left unto us a seed, we would have become as Sodom, and be made like unto Gomorrah" (Isa. 1:9). So Paul concludes that God cannot be blamed if Israel had not attained to the salvation which God had intended for it. Israel itself is to blame. By obstinately seeking salvation in its own way it stumbled at the stone of stumbling, while the heathen have become the recipients of divine grace. So the words of Isaiah are fulfilled: "Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling-block, and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed" (Isa. 8:14; 28:16).

A similar logical sequence based on a chain of Old Testament quotations is built up by the Apostle in Gal. 3:6-14, in a passage which is more argumentative than the passage from the Epistle to the Romans which we have just discussed. Here the Apostle is calling the attention of the Galatians to their experience as Christians. They have experienced the certainty that they are now "in the right with God" and have received His Spirit. "In what state were you in," asks St. Paul, "when this great experience came? Did it come as a result of your obedience to a written law, or as the result of the obedience which sprang from your faith?" They would be in no doubt as to the answer. They can therefore be truly called the real children of Abraham, because it is of Abraham that the Scripture says, "he believed in God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness." Paul then goes on to say that it was foretold in Scripture also that the Galatians, as part of the Gentiles, would receive righteousness in this way; for to Abraham was the promise given that "in him all the nations of the earth would be blessed." Moreover, to have faith similar to Abraham's faith is also to inherit the blessing promised to him and to his seed. The Christians there-

fore are the recipients of that blessing, which all through sacred history God had in mind for the children of men. The blessing could not be obtained by the process of observing the precepts of the law; for it is written in Deut. 27:26, "Cursed is everyone who abides not in all that is written in the book of the law to perform it": and that no one *has* kept all the law is a necessary deduction from another passage of Scripture—Hab. 2:4—which states that "the righteous man shall obtain life as a result of *faith*." If a complete obedience to the law had been a possibility, such a statement would have been irrelevant. The logical sequence is thus drawn from these passages of Scripture. Righteousness is the result of faith; the law is not concerned with faith but with doing; therefore the law cannot produce a state of righteousness. But if the law cannot produce a state of righteousness, it *does* produce a curse; and it was this curse which Jesus removed, so that the blessing might be available, when He hung on the cross and redeemed men from the curse by becoming a curse Himself; for it is written in Deut. 21:23: "Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree." Again we may say that once the Old Testament is recognized as a sacred history, in which God's purposes for mankind are set forth in different degrees and in different manners, this method of exegesis is not arbitrary. Paul is bringing out from the Old Testament the truth which becomes fully apparent when it is seen in the light of that which was its final fulfilment, viz., the death of Jesus.

But Paul goes further back even than to Moses and the Patriarchs in his presentation of Christianity as the fulfilment of the Old Testament. He goes back to the creation stories of Genesis. It was natural that he should do so, for it is the great axiom of his religious thought that in the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus the human race had a new beginning. The incarnate Christ was a new man, and all who live by faith in union with Him are "new creations" (II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15). To him Christ is the "second Adam"; and both in the Epistle to the Romans (Rom. 5:14) and in I Corinthians (I Cor. 15:22, 45) he draws a contrast between the two Adams. The first Adam was made by a creative act of God "a living soul"; the last Adam, Paul goes on to add, was "a life-giving spirit"—one, that is to say, who was able to impart to others the spiritual life which He himself possessed. In Rom. 5:14-21 he speaks of the original Adam as "a type of Him who was to come," and he draws both a parallel and a contrast between the two figures. The actions of both were universal in their results; and the sons of both (such is solidarity of the human race) share in the deeds of their sires. The transgression of the first Adam resulted in death for the many; and the saving act of grace of the second Adam resulted in life for the many. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

It was because Paul thought of Christ as the new Adam that he also, by a natural extension of thought, came to think of the Church, or fellowship of believers, as the Bride of Christ prefigured by Eve. So when he is expressing his anxiety over the Corinthians, lest they should fall a prey to the false Apostles who were claiming their allegiance, he says to them (II Cor. 11:2, 3): "I am jealous over you with godly jealousy; for I have

espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." To understand this passage we have to remember that in Jewish practice betrothal was of great significance. A betrothed girl was a widow if her betrothed died before the actual wedding. The verse therefore reflects the nuptial relationship which Paul considered to exist between Christ and His Church; and it also reminds us that it is from Jewish sources that this idea is taken by him, and from the opening stories in Genesis in particular.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians he develops this thought still further, and clearly has the second creation story in Genesis in mind. This story states that Eve was created out of a rib taken from the side of Adam. She was therefore literally "bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh." So the Church is to Paul the body of the second Adam, almost as much His body as was the body which He wore while on earth, an "extension of the Incarnation" as theologians have called it. Christ and His Church are "one flesh," as Adam and Eve were one flesh. It is important to notice that all this nuptial language is a natural extension of Paul's primary doctrine of justification by faith, which presupposes a very close and intimate relationship between the believer and Christ. With it he combines the idea, originating in Greek thought, of the body as made up of a number of individual members, each of which is essential to the life of the whole, and all of which are under the control of the head. It is, however, upon the nuptial idea that he bases his teaching about the marriage relationship of Christians.

In Eph. 5:21 to the end, he regards earthly marriage as a shadow of the eternal marriage of Christ and His Church; and the duties of husband and wife are conditioned by that higher relationship. The husband is in a position of authority over the wife, because Christ is the head of the Church. The husband's prime duty is to protect the wife, because Christ is "the saviour of His body the Church and gave Himself for it." The husband must therefore love his wife with the same kind of sacrificial love that Christ displayed on behalf of His body the Church. Wives, on the other hand, are to be in subjection to their own husbands, because of the obedience which is demanded by Christ from the Church. St. Paul ends the passage with words which make it clear that he regards the relationship that now exists between believers and Christ as a "fulfilment" of the Genesis story of creation; for he adds the passage quoted by Jesus Himself: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife—and the twain shall become one flesh"; and then says, "This mystery is great, but I speak of Christ and His Church."

But there is yet another imagery by which Paul portrays the close relationship between Christ and His Church, the fellowship of believers. Not only does he think of the Church as the body of Christ. He also regards it as a shrine of His indwelling presence. And in this too there is a fulfilment of the Old Testament, for it had ever been God's desire to tabernacle

amongst His people, a desire which had only been partially realized in the Old Israel. "Know ye not," Paul says to the Corinthians, when he wishes to warn them of the danger lest by their factions they may destroy the unity of their fellowship, "know ye not that ye are the shrine of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?": and he adds, "God's shrine is holy, and such a shrine are ye." Party strife is therefore nothing less than sacrilege.

Thus the Old Testament to St. Paul was true as far as it went, but imperfect. The moral laws of Moses had educated man's moral sense, but left the springs of conduct still impotent; the sacrifices had shown that sin must be atoned for, but had failed to make final atonement; the Tabernacle and the Temple had set forth the truth that without the presence of God men can never fulfil their true and proper destiny, but the Temple had become a symbol of national and religious exclusiveness. So the Old Dispensation was incomplete; unsatisfactory because unsatisfying. It all pointed to something better to come, when shadows would become reality, and prophecy would vanish away because the hour of fulfilment had come.

.

PAUL AND THE OLD TESTAMENT

Fernand Prat

THE EPISTLES of Paul abound with quotations, allusions, and reminiscences the examination of which becomes a necessity for the exegete and theologian desirous of not imputing alien ideas to the Apostle. . . .

1. Actual Quotations with Formulas of Quotation

<i>Epistle.</i>	<i>Passage quoted.</i>	<i>Formula.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
<i>Rom:</i>			
i, 17	Hab. ii, 4	καὼς γέγρ.	From the Septuagint.
ii, 24	Is. lii, 5	<i>Id.</i>	<i>Id.</i> (omission).
iii, 4	Ps. l, 6 cxv, 11	καθάπρ γέγρ.	<i>Id.</i> (composite).
iii, 10-12	Ps. xiii, 1-3	καθ. γέγρ. δτι.	} Series; from the Septuagint with different readings.
iii, 13a	Ps. v, 10	
iii, 13b	Ps. cxxxix, 4	
iii, 14	Ps. ix, 28 (x, 7)	
iii, 15-17	Is. lix, 7-8	
iii, 18	Ps. xxxv, 2	} From the Septuagint.
iv, 3, 9, 22	Gen. xv, 6	ἡ Γραφή λέγ.	
iv, 7-8	Ps. xxxi, 1-2	Δα. λέγει.	<i>Id.</i>
iv, 17	Gen. xvii, 5	καθ. γέγρ. δτι.	<i>Id.</i>
iv, 18	Gen. xv, 5	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημ.	<i>Id.</i>
vii, 7	Ex. xx, 17 (Deut. v, 21)	ὁ νόμ. ἔλεγεν.	<i>Id.</i>
viii, 36	Ps. xliii, 23	καθ. γεγρ. δτι.	<i>Id.</i>
ix, 7	Gen. xxi, 12	Special form	<i>Id.</i>
ix, 9	Gen. xviii, 10, 14	<i>Id.</i>	Variation (compos.)
ix, 12	Gen. xxv, 23	<i>Id.</i>	From the Septuagint.
ix, 13	Mal. i, 2-3	καθάπρ γέγ.	<i>Id.</i>
ix, 15	Fx. xxxiii, 19	τῷ Μω. γέγ.	<i>Id.</i>
ix, 17	Ex. ix, 16	λέγ. ἡ Γραφή.	After the Hebrew.
ix, 25-26	Hos. ii, 25, ii, 1	ἐν τῷ 'Ωσ. λέγ.	Free, composite.
ix, 27-28	Is. x, 22-23	'Ησ. κράζει.	Septuagint (with variations).
ix, 29	Is. i, 9	Special form	From the Septuagint.
ix, 33	Is. viii, 14	καὼς γέγρ.	Composite.
	xxviii, 16		
x, 5	Lev. xviii, 5	Μω. γράφει.	Very free.
x, 6-9	Deut. xxx, 12-14	Special form	Commentary.
x, 11	Is. xxviii, 16	λέγει ἡ Γρ.	Very free.
x, 15	Is. lii, 7	καθάπρ. γέγρ.	<i>Id.</i>
x, 16	Is. liii, 1	'Ησ. λέγει.	Septuagint.
x, 19	Deut. xxxii, 21	Μω. λέγει.	<i>Id.</i> (variation)
x, 20	Is. lxxv, 1	'Ησ. λέγει.	<i>Id.</i> (inversion)
x, 21	Is. lxxv, 2	<i>Id.</i>	<i>Id.</i>
xi, 3	1 Kings xix, 10	λέγει ἡ Γρ.	Very free.
xi, 4	1 Kings xix, 18	λέγει ὁ χρημ.	After the Hebrew.
xi, 8	Is. xxix, 10	καθάπρ. γέγρ.	Composite.
	Deut. xxix, 3		

From *The Theology of Saint Paul*, Vol. I, Westminster, Md., 1946, pp. 411-14. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The Newman Press.

<i>Epistle.</i>	<i>Passage quoted.</i>	<i>Formula.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
<i>Rom.:</i>			
xi, 9-10	Ps. lxviii, 23-24	Δα. λέγει.	Septuagint (variations). Composite.
xi, 26-27	Is. lix, 20 xxvii, 9	καθὼς γέγρ.	
xii, 19	Deut. xxxii, 35	γέγραπται.	After the Hebrew.
xii, 20	Prov. xxv, 21-22	<i>Id.</i>	After the Septuagint.
xiii, 9	Ex. xx, 13-15 Deut. v, 17-19	Special form	Composite.
xiv, 11	Is. xlv, 23 xlix, 18	γέγραπται.	<i>Id.</i>
xv, 3	Ps. lxviii, 10	καθὼς γέγρ.	After the Septuagint. Series: After the Septuagint (with inversions). After the Septuagint.
xv, 9	Ps. xvii, 50	<i>Id.</i>	
xv, 10	Deut. xxxii, 43	πάλιν λέγει.	
xv, 11	Ps. cxvi, 1	καὶ πάλιν.	
xv, 12	Is. xi, 10	πάλ. Ἦσ. λέγ.	
xv, 21	Is. lii, 15	καθὼς γέγρ.	
<i>1 Cor.:</i>			
i, 19	Is. xxix, 14	γέγραπται.	Septuagint (with variations).
i, 31	Jer. ix, 22-23, etc.	καθὼς γέγρ.	Very free.
ii, 9	Is. lxiv, 3 lxv, 17	<i>Id.</i>	<i>Id.</i>
iii, 19	Job v, 12-13	γέγραπται.	After the Hebrew.
iii, 20	Ps. xciii, 11	καὶ πάλιν.	Septuagint (with variations).
vi, 16	Gen. ii, 24	φησίν.	After the Septuagint.
ix, 9	Deut. xxv, 4	ἐν τῷ Μω. γέγρ	<i>Id.</i>
x, 7	Ex. xxxii, 6	ὡσπερ γέγρ.	<i>Id.</i>
xiv, 21	Is. xxviii, 11-12	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γ.	Very free (Hebrew?)
xv, 45	Gen. ii, 7	οὕτως γέγρ.	Free.
xv, 54-55	Is. xxv, 8 Os. xiii, 14	ὁ λόγος ὁ γ.	Composite.
<i>2 Cor.:</i>			
iv, 13	Ps. cxv, 10	κατὰ τὸ γεγρ.	After the Septuagint.
vi, 2	Is. xlix, 8	λέγει.	<i>Id.</i>
vi, 16	Ez. xxxvii, 27	καθ. εἶπεν ὁ θ.	Series: After Septuagint, very free.
vi, 17	Is. lii, 11-12	
vi, 18	2 Sam. vii, 14	
viii, 15	Ex. xvi, 18	καθὼς γέγρ.	Septuagint (with inversions).
x, 9	Ps. cxi, 9	<i>Id.</i>	After the Septuagint.
<i>Gal.:</i>			
iii, 8	Gen. xii, 3	Special form	Septuagint (with variations).
iii, 10	Deut. xxvii, 26	γέγρ. ὅτι.	Septuagint, free.
iii, 13	Deut. xxi, 23	ὅτι γέγρ.	Septuagint (with variations).
iv, 22	Gen. xvi, 15, etc.	γέγραπτ. ὅτι.	Without textual quotation.
iv, 27	Is. liv, 1	γέγραπται.	After the Septuagint.
iv, 30	Gen. xxi, 10	λέγει ἡ Γρ.	Septuagint (with variations).
v, 14	Lev. xix, 18	Special form	After the Septuagint.

<i>Epistle.</i>	<i>Passage quoted.</i>	<i>Formula.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
<i>Eph.</i> : iv, 8	Ps. lxxvii, 19	διὸ λέγει.	Neither Hebrew nor Septuagint.
v, 14	?	διὸ λέγει.	<i>Id.</i>
vi, 2-3	Ex. xx, 12 (Deut. v, 16)	Special form	Septuagint (with variations).
1 <i>Tim.</i> : v, 18	Deut. xxv, 4	λέγει ἡ Γρ.	Septuagint (with inversions).
2 <i>Tim.</i> : ii, 19	Num. xvi, 5; Is. xxvi, 13	Special form	Septuagint (with variations).

2. Tacit Quotations, Allusions, Reminiscences.

<i>Epistle.</i>	<i>Passage referred to.</i>	<i>Epistle.</i>	<i>Passage referred to.</i>
<i>Rom.</i> : i, 20-32	Wisdom xiii, 1 and <i>passim</i> .	1 <i>Cor.</i> : vi, 17	Deut. x, 20; xi, 22
i, 23	Ps. cv, 20	x, 5	Num. xiv, 16
ii, 6	Ps. lxi, 13	x, 6	Num. xi, 4, 34
ii, 11	Ecclus. xxxii, 15-16	x, 20	Deut. xxxii, 17
*iii, 20	Ps. cxlii, 2	x, 21	Mal. i, 7, 12
iv, 11	Gen. xvii, 10-11	x, 22	Deut. xxxii, 21
iv, 25	Is. liii, 4-5	x, 26	Ps. xxxii, 1
v, 5	Ps. xxi, 6	xi, 7	Gen. i, 27
*v, 12	Gen. ii, 17; iii, 19	xi, 25	Ex. xxiv, 8; Zach. ix, 11
*vii, 2-3	Deut. ii, 1-4	xiii, 5	Zach. viii, 17
vii, 11	Gen. iii, 13	xiv, 25	Is. xlv, 14, etc.
viii, 33	Is. l, 8-9	*xiv, 34	Gen. iii, 16
viii, 34	Ps. cix, 1	xv, 25	Ps. cix, 1
*ix, 7	Gen. xxi, 12	xv, 27	Ps. viii, 7
ix, 18	Ex. iv, 21; vii, 3, etc.	xv, 32	Is. xxii, 13
ix, 20	Is. xxix, 16; xlv, 9, etc.	2 <i>Cor.</i> : iii, 3	Ex. xxxi, 18; Ez. xi, 19, etc.
ix, 21	Wisdom xv, 17		
*x, 13	Joel iii, 5	*iii, 7-18	Ex. xxxiv, 29-35, etc.
*x, 18	Ps. xviii, 5	v, 4	Wisdom ix, 15
xi, 1-2	Ps. xciii, 14, etc.	v, 10	Ecclus. xii, 14
xi, 32	Wisdom xi, 23	v, 17	Is. xliii, 18-19
*xi, 34-35	Is. xl, 13; Job xli, 3		
xii, 16-17	Prov. iii, 7; iii, 4	vi, 9	Ps. cxvii, 17-18
1 <i>Cor.</i> : i, 20	Is. xix, 11, 12	vi, 11	Ps. cxviii, 32
	xxiii, 18	vii, 6	Is. xlix, 13
*ii, 16	Is. xl, 13	viii, 21	Prov. iii, 4 (LXX)
v, 7	Ex. xii, 21	ix, 7	Prov. xxii, 8 (LXX)
v, 13	Deut. xxii, 24, etc.	ix, 10	Is. lv, 10 Oc. x, 12
vi, 2	Wisdom iii, 8	x, 17	Jer. ix, 23
vi, 12-13	Eccl. xxxvii, 28	xi, 3	Gen. iii, 4, 13
	xxxvi, 23	xiii, 1	Deut. xix, 15

<i>Epistle.</i>	<i>Passage referred to.</i>	<i>Epistle.</i>	<i>Passage referred to.</i>
<i>Gal.:</i>			
i, 15-16	Is. xlix, 1 Jer. i, 5	<i>1 Thess.:</i>	
*ii, 16	Ps. cxlii, 2	ii, 4	Jer. xi, 20
*iii, 6	Gen. xv, 6	ii, 16	Gen. xv, 16; 2 Macc. vi, 14
*iii, 11	Hab. ii, 4	iv, 5	Jer. x, 25
*iii, 12	Lev. xviii, 5	iv, 8	Ez. xxxvii, 14
*iii, 16	Gen. xii, 7, etc.	iv, 13	Wisdom iii, 18
vi, 16	Ps. cxxiv, 5	v, 8	Is. lix, 17
		v, 22	Job i, 1, 8; ii, 3
<i>Eph.:</i>			
i, 18	Wisdom v, 5	<i>2 Thess.:</i>	
i, 20	Ps. cix, 1	i, 8	Is. lxvi, 15
i, 22	Ps. viii, 7	i, 9-10	Is. ii, 10, 11, 19, 21
ii, 13-17	Is. lvii, 19; lii, 7	i, 10	Zach. xiv, 5
ii, 20	Is. xxviii, 16		Ps. lxvii, 36
*iv, 25	Zach. viii, 16	i, 12	Is. lxvi, 5
*iv, 26	Ps. iv, 5	ii, 4	Dan. xi, 36; Ez.
v, 2	Ps. xxxix, 7; Ez.		xxviii, 2
	xx, 41	ii, 8	
v, 18	Prov. xxiii, 31 (LXX)	ii, 13	Is. xi, 4
*v, 31	Gen. ii, 24		Deut. xxxiii, 12
*vi, 14a	Is. xi, 5	<i>1 Tim.:</i>	
*vi, 14b	Is. lix, 17	ii, 6	
*vi, 17	Is. xlix, 2	ii, 12	Is. liii, 11-12
		ii, 13	Gen. iii, 16
<i>Phil.:</i>		ii, 14	Gen. ii, 7
i, 19	Job xiii, 16	*v, 19	Gen. iii, 6
ii, 10-11	Is. xlv, 23	vi, 1	Deut. xix, 15
*ii, 15	Deut. xxxii, 5	vi, 15	Is. lu, 5
ii, 16	Is. xlix, 4; lxxv, 23		Deut. x, 17; Dan. ii, 47
iv, 3	Ps. lxxviii, 29	<i>2 Tim.:</i>	
iv, 18	Ez. xx, 41	iv, 14	
			Ps. lxi, 13; Prov.
<i>Col.:</i>			xxiv, 12
ii, 3	Is. xlv, 3	<i>Titus:</i>	
ii, 22	Is. xxix, 13	ii, 5	Is. lii, 5
iii, 1	Ps. cix, 1	*ii, 14	Is. liii, 12
iii, 10	Gen. i, 27		

In the passages marked with a star the quotation or allusion is manifestly intentional. St. Paul makes many more allusions to the Old Testament than we have been able to indicate. It has been impossible for us to take into account the passages which refer to a fact or a thought of the Old Testament, but without any expression common to both; for example, Rom. v, 12 (*cf.* Gen. ii, 17; iii, 19; vi, 23); 1 Cor. xi, 8-9 (*cf.* Gen. ii, 18-23), etc.

THE FIRST COLLECTION OF PAUL'S LETTERS

Edgar J. Goodspeed

LUKE-ACTS STANDS forth as a great missionary record. It is the story of the Greek mission. It carries the reader straight up to the martyrdom of Paul but with great restraint stops short of narrating it, while unmistakably forecasting it in the underscored presentiments of his farewell to the Ephesian elders, Acts 20:25, 38; 21:13. It must have greatly revived and stimulated interest in the figure of Paul, which was already beginning to disappear into the past, as all figures inevitably tend to do. But with all his interest in Paul and admiration for him, Luke has no acquaintance with his letters.

It is sometimes maintained that, if he had been with Paul, he must have known the letters he wrote. But this is to forget that writing letters was the least of the activities of the living Paul. They were simply incidents in his busy life of effort and movement. Paul's conversation, his preaching, and his journeys would be much more outstanding features of his in the eyes of his personal companions and associates. Nor were the letters we possess written during the periods when Acts represents Luke as being with Paul. Moreover, Paul's letters were all addressed to immediate local situations, and with the passing of each of these the interest of the letter concerned with it naturally evaporated. This is the explanation of the fact that the gospel literature . . . —Mark, Matthew, and Luke-Acts—shows no influence of Paul's letters.

But from this point on the situation is reversed. Every Christian document shows acquaintance with Paul's letters—the Revelation, Hebrews, I Clement, I Peter, the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp, the Gospel of John. This is, in fact, the key to the later literature of the New Testament; it is all written in the presence of the collected Pauline letters. Over against the total nonacquaintance of the earlier evangelists the difference is positively glaring. Before the publication of Luke-Acts nobody knew them; after the appearance of Luke-Acts everybody knows them.

And not just one or two of them, or three or four. Almost the first book to show acquaintance with them is the Revelation of John, written by the prophet of Ephesus in exile on Patmos. His book is so swayed by the newly published corpus of Paul's letter to seven churches that he actually begins his book with a corpus of letters to seven churches. If any literary resemblance could be more striking and massive than this, it is difficult to imagine what it would be. Yet students of the Revelation have been so en-

From *An Introduction to the New Testament*, Chicago, 1937, pp. 210-21. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The University of Chicago Press.

grossed in its apocalyptic atmosphere that this obvious fact about it, which strikes one in the face on the first page, has actually escaped their attention.

But it is most unnatural for an apocalypse to begin with a letter, still less with a corpus of letters—seven letters, in fact—and these letters addressed to Christian churches. Can this possibly be dismissed as coincidence? Not when we observe the further fact that the Revelation corpus is not a real collection of letters that have been sent to their several readers; the collection is avowedly a literary device, and all the letters go to all the churches. It is no actual collection of letters once sent and later collected that meets us in Revelation, chapters 1–3. The letters are written as a collection and made to form the portal of the Apocalypse, and the whole work is sent to all the churches in the list.

We cannot suppose that this artificial corpus of letters preceded the actual gathering-together of Paul's letters scattered among seven churches. It is clear that the real collection of letters to seven churches must have preceded the artificial one, which was simply an imitation of it. Indeed, if the Revelation had been discovered yesterday, instead of having been familiar to us all from childhood, this fact would have been at once apparent and would have been everywhere recognized. The portal of the Revelation was suggested by the recent appearance of a collection of Paul's letters to seven churches. Even the salutation of 1:4, "Blessing to you and peace," is the characteristic Pauline letter salutation, unknown elsewhere in the New Testament and strange to Greek epistolary practice.

It is important to observe the extent to which the letters of Paul are reflected in the literature immediately following Luke-Acts, and perhaps the accompanying tabular view will make this clear.

		Rev	Heb.	I Clem.	I Pet	John	Ign	Poly	Jas.	Marcion	Pas- torals	II Pet.
	Eph	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Rom	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
I Cor	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
II Cor	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Gal	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Phil	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Col	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
I Thess	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
II Thess	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Philem	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

This table owes much to the one prepared by Dr. A. E. Barnett in his elaborate study, "The Use of the Letters of Paul in Pre-Catholic Christian Literature" (p. 612). The conservative character of his results is shown by the fact that he lists as reasonably certain the use of only five Pauline letters in II Peter, and yet that epistle speaks of "all his letters," regards them as Scripture, and laments the heretical (Marcionite) misuse of them, so that its author quite certainly possessed all ten. McNeile quotes Turner as saying that the Epistle of Polycarp is "crowded with indubitable echoes of at least eight" of Paul's letters, but this includes I and II Timothy, which Turner thought were quoted; the others are Romans, I and II Corinthians, Ephesians, II Thessalonians, and Philippians.

It is customary to explain these facts by the supposition that different

collections of Paul's letters existed in different hands. But this loses sight of four important considerations:

First, few people who possess all Paul's letters make use of all of them in a single letter or group of letters—II Thessalonians and Philemon, for example. It would be manifestly wrong to infer from the fact that you or I do not quote these writings that we did not possess them but used a collection of Paul's letters from which they were absent.

Second, the theory makes it necessary to suppose that there were four or five different collections of Paul's letters in circulation about the close of the first century.

Third, the Revelation, the earliest book to reflect them, reflects a collection of letters to seven churches, preceded by a general letter to all seven; which makes it extremely likely that the writer had all ten of the letters in the collection known at Ephesus, for it consisted of a general letter and letters to seven churches.

Fourth, Ephesians, which was from the beginning in the collection (for it was used in I Clement, as Bishop Lightfoot long ago saw), shows unmistakable acquaintance with all nine of the accepted letters—Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, I and II Thessalonians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. The table appended to my *Meaning of Ephesians* will, I think, satisfy the reader of this fact. When this is once recognized, all the subsequent uses of the Pauline letters fall into natural relations. We have only one collection of Pauline letters to postulate and explain. The whole matter of the uses of Paul's letters in the Christian writings about the end of the first century and the beginning of the second is cleared up.

It is natural to ask what situation could have precipitated the making of such a collection. It is usually the death of a great man that arouses interest in his work and leads to the publication of his collected letters. But it cannot have been Paul's martyrdom that led to the collecting and publishing of his letters, for in that case the collection would have been in circulation before the writing of any of the gospels, and their nonacquaintance with it would be unaccountable.

The next event that drew marked attention to the figure and work of Paul was the appearance of Luke-Acts with its impressive picture of him and his work for the Greek mission. It was the most imposing Christian literary work that had thus far appeared and must have notably revived interest in Paul as the apostle to the Greeks, the founder of the Greek mission, the martyr to that cause, Acts 20:25, 38. The Pauline interest forms an unmistakable crescendo in the Acts from his introduction in 7:58 to the end. To suppose that this ringing glorification of Paul could have had no effect upon early Christian literature is hardly reasonable. We should expect it to have some effect and to have it at once, for in ancient as in modern times a book's best chance of influence is immediately upon its publication, when the public for which it was written and out of which it grew is still alive, and the situation which called it forth is still acute. What could possibly have been added to what Acts says about Paul, except to assemble his letters? But how could anyone have thought of this unless he already

knew of some letters of Paul? There is nothing whatever in the Acts to suggest that Paul ever wrote any letters of any particular moment any more than anyone else.

Yet Paul himself had given a hint for the bringing-together of two of his letters when he instructed the Colossians to send his letter to them on to the Laodiceans, and to read the letter that was coming from there, Col. 4:16. These two letters must have been preserved together, either at Colossae or at Laodicea or in both churches. Suppose a man who had been in one or the other of those churches, or who had visited those places and seen those letters, read the glowing account of Paul in the Acts, the most telling and unforgettable account of him that has ever been written. The Book of Acts unrolls before him a whole series of Paul's movements of which he has been unaware. The thought occurs to him: Perhaps some of those churches—Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Thessalonica, Philippi—may have received letters from Paul and may even still possess them. It is a curious and striking fact that the Acts would have guided an Asian collector of Pauline letters to all these churches, but it would never have guided a Roman or Corinthian collector to Colossae or Laodicea, for those places are not mentioned in the Acts. It is therefore extremely probable that Colossians-Laodiceans (=Col.-Philem.) formed the nucleus of the Pauline collection, and doubly so when we remember that Paul himself had been instrumental in getting those two letters together.

A series of considerations thus arises pointing to some Asian center of Christianity, such as Ephesus, as the place where the Pauline corpus was probably first assembled:

1. Colossians-Philemon seems to have been the nucleus of it, for Acts would never have guided the collector to the churches at Colossae and Laodicea, while it would have guided anyone already possessed of Colossians-Philemon to all the other Christian centers represented in the corpus by letters. But Colossians and Philemon were letters written to churches in Asia.

2. The use of so much material from Colossians in Ephesians is most naturally explained if the writer of Ephesians had long known Colossians and pored over it, as he must have done when it was the only considerable Pauline letter he possessed. Almost three-fifths of Colossians is paralleled in Ephesians.

3. Ephesus had become the leading Christian center by A.D. 90, being, as Harnack put it, the second fulcrum of Christianity after Antioch. It was the home of the writer of the Revelation, in which the Pauline corpus finds its first literary reflection. After Ephesians, Revelation, chapters 1-3.

4. Ephesus a few years later witnessed (and probably stimulated) the writing and collecting of the letters of Ignatius, another collection of letters conditioned by the Pauline corpus.

5. At about the same time Ephesus witnessed the writing of the Gospel of John, a work strongly influenced by the Pauline corpus.

6. It also produced the Johannine letter-corpus for missionary and apologetic purposes, I, II, and III John.

7. It also in all probability produced the fourfold gospel collection, *ca.* A.D. 120, to promote the circulation and influence of the new Gospel of John.

8. The fact that the collectors of the letters had Phoebe's letter of introduction (Rom., chap. 16) points to Ephesus, where as we have seen she was probably going, and where the letter might be preserved as a souvenir of Paul and unobtrusively worked into the collection when it was afterward made. It would be difficult to explain its presence anywhere else.

9. It is a perplexing fact that Ignatius writes to the Ephesians, chapter 13, that Paul in every letter "mentions them" or "calls them to mind." He certainly does not "mention" them in anything like every letter. But if the Ephesian church had published the Pauline letters, the difficulty disappears. For in Ignatius' day every letter of Paul would bring to the reader's mind the Ephesians as the collectors and publishers of his letters. The Ephesians would understand the gracious allusion.

Not only did the publication of the Pauline corpus so revive interest in the letter as an important form for Christian instruction, and thus call forth a shower of church letters—Revelation, Hebrews, I Clement, I Peter, Ignatius, Polycarp, etc.—but it led to the production and circulation of other corpuses of letters.

The ancients were familiar with published letter collections. There was the Plato letter collection of thirteen letters. There were the letters of Aristotle and Epicurus. The letters of Apollonius of Tyana were soon after collected and circulated. In Latin there were the letters of Cicero, from the middle of the first century before Christ, and early in the second century A.D. Pliny published his own letters, dedicating the collection to his friend Septicius who, he said, had often urged him to collect and publish his letters: "*Frequenter hortatus es ut epistulas, si quas accuratius scripsissem, colligerem publicaremque,*" i. I.

It is striking that, after the Pauline corpus, there followed in Christian circles the letter corpus of the Revelation, chapters 1-3 (letters to seven churches, preceded by a general letter to all seven); the Ignatian corpus of seven letters, six to churches and one to an individual, A.D. 107-17; the Johannine corpus—for the organization of that collection, with one general letter, one church letter, and one personal letter, at once suggests that it was written as a unit, and the brevity and comparative slightness of II and III John make it most unlikely that they would have been preserved and circulated by themselves; and the Pastoral corpus, written as a corpus and circulated as part of the enlarged Pauline corpus into which it was at once incorporated. For all these corpuses the Pauline is the great precedent and model, and to all of them it is in a sense the key.

We must therefore no longer treat the several units of these various corpuses atomistically; they must be studied as corpuses if they are to be historically understood, for they originated not as separate units but as full-fledged collections. This is recognized in the case of the Revelation corpus, and it must be recognized in the case of the Johannine and the Pastoral corpuses as well.

In one other respect the collection and publication of the Pauline corpus

are of great significance for subsequent Christian literature. It was the beginning of the *publication* of Christian letters, and Christian letters were thereafter often written for publication. That is, the publication of Paul's letters with the new encyclical "Ephesians" at their head led directly to the Christian *epistle*—Hebrews, I Peter, I John, James (originally a sermon but published as an encyclical epistle), etc.

In all these ways the Pauline corpus has important significance for New Testament Introduction. A new literary atmosphere now pervades the Christian movement. From this time on all its writing is done in the presence of the Pauline corpus.

THE PAULINE EVIDENCE

Maurice Goguel

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

NO LITERARY evidence about Jesus is earlier than that contained in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. In the eyes of many readers, the fact that these letters were collected into a series towards the end of the first century, and, half a century later, were incorporated into the Canon of the New Testament, to some extent changed their character. Instead of realizing that Paul's letters were the spontaneous overflow of a sensitive, vital personality, who gave free course to his emotions, to his enthusiasm and his indignation alike, men saw in them nothing but theological treatises.

The Pauline Epistles are not literary works in the usual sense of the word; that is to say, they were not written to supplement the writer's direct activity, when it could not be exercised on account of distance. They were not written for an indefinite public without regard for time or place. They are, however, far more valuable than those private letters which the study of the papyri has unearthed, because they supplement, not the simple and banal conversation of everyday life, but the work of preaching and teaching.

In the Epistles we find the reflection of an activity which, at a very early date, diffused Christianity throughout one part of the eastern basin of the Mediterranean, and of a system of thought which fixed the setting within which Christian doctrine was developed. In order to understand these letters we need to forget the halo which has surrounded them for the last eighteen hundred years, a halo whose glorification makes them unnatural. We must regard them not as a species of encyclical letters, but as incidental writings, hastily improvised between journeys, dictated in the evening after a day devoted to manual labour, or to preaching, or to both at once, by a man overburdened with fatigue and the cares of the churches, forced to meet all kinds of unexpected emergencies as best he may: to clear up a misunderstanding, to give instruction or warning to some individual or group, to answer questions which have been put to him. Each letter was written to meet some particular situation; if that were to disappear, the letter would lose its interest. Paul never wrote with an eye to the future; he was writing simply for the present. In the Early Church there is no trace of any custom of the regular reading of his letters. They were read aloud at the meetings of the faithful, perhaps from time to time they were reread as long as the question which had called them forth was occupying men's

From *The Life of Jesus*, New York, 1945, pp. 105-27. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The Macmillan Company.

minds; then they were placed among the records, though without any special care for their preservation; for when, between 90 and 100, people began to collect Paul's letters, it was discovered that several of them had been lost, and even the manuscripts of several of those which had been preserved, especially those of the letters to the Corinthians, were in rather bad condition.

Therefore we must not expect to find a complete statement of Paul's faith and theology in his Epistles. We do not find in them all he knew or all he believed. Written for people whom he himself had taught, they assume what his readers know already; very often they are based on allusions to instruction already given by the Apostle, and to the tradition common to primitive Christianity.

Paul bears a twofold witness to Jesus: first of all by his theology, and then by what we can gather from his letters in the form of quotations, or simple memories of words of Jesus, or allusions to certain facts in his life.

.

THE DEPENDENCE OF PAUL ON AN HISTORICAL TRADITION

Another definite proof of the fact that the Apostle Paul did depend upon previous historical tradition is the attitude which he adopted before and after his conversion.

From the narrative in the Book of the Acts, and even on the testimony of the Epistles, we know that Paul had been previously a violent persecutor of the Christians. It is evident that he must have come into touch with the disciples of the Carpenter of Nazareth during the period which immediately followed the drama of Calvary. He was horribly scandalized to see them pinning their faith to a man upon whom rested the curse of God. What he felt may be surmised from the formula which he himself was to coin at a later stage: "Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block" (1 Cor. i. 23; cf. Gal. v. 11). In his eyes Christians were blasphemers and sacrilegious people; therefore the authorities ought to take action against them, and it was the duty of every loyal Jew to give the authorities all the help they could, and to inflame their zeal still further.

Thus the Cross dominated the period which preceded the conversion of Paul just as, later on, it would also dominate his Christian life. Paul the persecutor is thus a witness to the truth of the crucifixion. The date of this evidence gives it a position of special importance.

The attitude of Paul towards the Twelve, the brothers of the Lord, and the Church at Jerusalem, also proves his dependence on historical tradition. Paul speaks incidentally of James and the other brothers of the Lord (Gal. i. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 5). Drews, it is true, has argued that the term "brethren of the Lord" means "a group of Christians distinguished by their piety." But if that were so, the brothers of the Lord could not be mentioned as constituting a special group of persons different from the Apostles. Alfarcic, arguing from the passage in Rom. viii. 29, where Christ is called the "first-

born among many brethren," claims that the term ought to be taken in a spiritual sense only; but if this term, "brothers of the Lord," were derived from the idea expressed in this passage, then it ought to be applied to all Christians. It is therefore impossible to interpret Gal. i. 19 and 1 Cor. ix. 5 otherwise than as a reference to the brothers of Jesus "after the flesh"; the fact that Paul knew them makes it very clear that he was in touch with an historical tradition. Paul claims for his apostolate an authority equal to that of the apostolate of the Twelve, but in order to obtain recognition he had to be very insistent (Gal. ii. 1-10). The energy and tenacity with which he insists upon his apostolic authority show that his claims must have seemed presumptuous and paradoxical to those who witnessed the controversy. The term "chiefest apostles" (*οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι*, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11), which he applies in derision to those who opposed him, shows that they could pride themselves on some advantage which he did not possess. His claims could not be contested so far as Judaism was concerned (Phil. iii. 4-6; 2 Cor. xi. 21-22), nor from the point of view of visions and signs which he had received (2 Cor. xii. 1-12). One text in the Epistle to the Galatians: "Whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me" (ii. 6), shows that the claim which was used to support the superiority of the Twelve belonged to the past. Their claim must have been this—and it was one Paul could not deny—that they had been witnesses of the life of Jesus and the companions of his ministry. This reflection illuminates the passage in 2 Cor. v. 16, where Paul declares that henceforth to have known Christ after the flesh is a matter of no interest or importance. This was an advantage which the Twelve possessed, and which he did not possess, and this is why he denies that it has any value.

In spite of the opposition he encountered—(exaggerated by the Tübingen school, though it did exist)—and the conflicts which took place between him and the Apostles at Jerusalem, who remained attached to Judaism and its practices, Paul was fully conscious of the unity of Christianity (1 Cor. xv. 11). In spite of his certainty that he possessed a revelation which was full and sufficient (Gal. i. 1 ff.), he insisted on keeping in touch with the Church of Jerusalem. The story of Gal. ii. 1-10 shows how much he valued the recognition of his apostolate and of his preaching of the Gospel by the heads of the Church in Jerusalem, and when the crises which took place in Galatia and Corinth seemed to render uncertain that which seemed to have been definitely settled at the conference of 44, he insisted on going to Jerusalem himself, in order to get into touch with James once more, although he was quite aware to what dangers this proceeding would expose him (Rom. xv. 30-32 proves this up to the hilt). We can only understand the importance that Paul attached to these matters if we remember that in the action of Christ, to whom he owed the birth of his faith, Paul saw the extension and the consequence of the historical ministry of Jesus, to which the Christianity of the Twelve and of the Church of Jerusalem owed its origin.

PAUL AND THE GOSPEL TRADITION

The very structure of the thought of Paul, his relations with the Church of Jerusalem, all that he says about the Twelve and the brothers of Jesus, his whole activity, both as a persecutor and then as a missionary, make the Apostle a witness to an historical tradition. Even if the Pauline evidence did not amount to more than this, it would establish the fact that in the very earliest documents which mention Jesus he is represented as an historical personage.

But Paul's knowledge was not limited to the bare fact that Jesus had lived upon the earth; he had a definite idea of the story of his life. If we were to act upon a suggestion made by Renan, we would find, as he says, that there is sufficient material in the Epistles from which we might construct a "small *Life of Jesus*." It is important for the historian to be able to state that the testimony of Paul confirms that of the Gospels, and confirms its reliability. Wishing to revive the memory of his preaching in Galatia Paul writes: "You, before whose eyes Christ crucified has been placarded" (Gal. iii. 1). This simple phrase proves that a picture of the death of Jesus, as vivid and as impressive as possible, had occupied a central place in the preaching of Paul. Of all the details with which it was filled, one alone can be discovered in the Epistles, and that is that Jesus died by crucifixion. The Apostle would certainly not have spoken about the death of Jesus without having said who this person was whose sufferings were of such extraordinary importance, without having given some account of his character and of his life, without having reported some of his sayings. Of all this the Epistles only retain a few faint traces. From them we learn that Jesus is man, that he was born of a woman (Gal. iv. 4; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 21; Rom. v. 15), that he belonged to the race of Abraham (Gal. iii. 16; Rom. ix. 5), and to the family of David (Rom. i. 3). He lived under the Jewish Law (Gal. iv. 4; Rom. xv. 8) and died upon a cross (*passim*), and, like the prophets, he was a victim of the Jews (1 Thess. ii. 15). Before he died, at a last meal with his disciples, he distributed to them bread and wine, as his body and his blood, and invited them to repeat this rite (1 Cor. xi. 23-25). Finally Paul mentions the burial of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 4) and bears witness to the tradition concerning his appearances after his resurrection. He knows also that Jesus had brothers, among whom he names James, and apostles, who were associated with his work, of whom he names two, Peter and John. Fairly numerous passages mention the moral character of Jesus, speaking, for instance, of his holiness, of his gentleness, of his love. It is better not to lay too much stress on these passages, however, for it is never possible to decide whether these passages refer to the historical Jesus or to the pre-existent and glorified Christ. The Apostle never gives any circumstantial details of time and place; the protagonists of the myth theory argue that such a doctrinaire biography can only be a myth. But myths are not usually so restrained, and, above all, the Epistles allude to, but do not narrate, the story of Jesus. We ought not to attach a great deal of importance to the absence of chronological data. Luke is the only evangelist who attempts

to give any indications of this kind (iii. 1 ff.). Mark, Matthew, and John, who did not trouble about chronology at all, were nevertheless sure that they were telling a real story. Indirectly, it is true, they do furnish some chronological information when they tell us that it was Pilate who pronounced the sentence of death on Jesus. But, indirectly, Paul too provides us with chronological information when he says that Christ, three days after his resurrection from the dead, appeared unto Cephas, to James, then "to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now" (1 Cor. xv. 3 ff.). All these witnesses of the resurrection are the contemporaries of the Apostle. Thus the drama of the Passion took place during a period which was quite close to that in which he lived.

The explanation which the mythologues have evolved from the scanty data supplied by Paul also shows the weakness of their position. They regard these data as the development and presentation of prophetic themes from the Old Testament. How then do they explain the fact that the passages from which they imagine Paul derived his information (that is, Isa. liii, Psa. xxii, and the Wisdom of Solomon ii. 19-20) are not mentioned by him?

Alfaric attaches great importance to the fact that in order to justify his preaching and his theology Paul does not appeal to the testimony of those who had heard Jesus, but "painfully deduces his proofs from archaic passages." From this he concludes that the Twelve were no better informed than he was. In this line of argument there is a peculiar anachronism. Because the scriptural arguments of Paul seem to a modern to be lacking in validity, Alfaric thinks that he only made use of them because he could find nothing better. But in those days the argument from the Scriptures was the one which appeared the most decisive. It is sufficient to recall the part played by the prophecies in the writings of Justin Martyr.

As he is a witness to the facts of the life of Jesus, Paul is also a witness of the tradition which related to his words. There are three at least which are explicitly quoted.

In 1 Cor. vii. 10, Paul writes: "But unto the married I give charge, yea, not I but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband." The point of this passage is emphasized by the fact that in the same chapter the Apostle declares that in the case of virgins and those who are unmarried he had "no commandment of the Lord" (vii. 25; cf. 40) and that the instructions which he gives to Christians married to pagans are introduced by the words: "To the rest say I, not the Lord" (vii. 12). The commandment of the Lord invoked in vii. 10 is a saying of Jesus preserved in two slightly different forms in Mark x. 11-12 and in Matt. v. 32. If the word of the Lord were, as Couchoud thinks it must have been, an inspired saying, it would be surprising that on questions so important as those relating to the marriage of persons belonging to different religious communities, the Spirit did not produce oracles which were necessary for the life of the Church. Alfaric thinks that in this verse the "word of the Lord" means the teaching of the Old Testament; if this were so, however, how is it that Paul does not quote the passages from which he drew his inspiration? How is it

that—knowing that the Old Testament was considered a complete revelation of the will of God, and that the methods of interpretation then in vogue would make it possible to discover in its pages answers to questions quite remote from the mind of its writers—Paul did not find in the Old Testament instructions for the case of virgins, and of married people belonging to different religious communities?

In 1 Cor. ix. 14, in order to establish the right of those who preach the Gospel to be supported by the Churches, Paul says: "Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." Here, again, Alfarc thinks we are dealing with a command in the Old Testament, but he does not notice that in the preceding words Paul has first of all invoked a rational argument (ix. 7), that he then appeals to the Old Testament (ix. 8-13), and that the authority of the Lord is added to these proofs, and constitutes a final argument which closes the discussion. The word of Jesus to which Paul alludes seems to be that which is preserved in Luke x. 7, and Matt. x. 10.

The last quotation of the words of Jesus which is found in the Epistles of Paul is also the most important, and is the one which has provoked most discussion.

In 1 Cor. xi. 23-25, Paul writes: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks he brake it and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

With the exception of a few critics who belong more or less directly to the radical Dutch school and of Drews, until recently the authenticity of this passage was scarcely questioned, and the arguments which have been put forward against it have seemed weak even to those who defend the myth theory.

The theory of the interpolation of verses 23-25 was put forward by Loisy, in 1927, at least in the form of an hypothesis. His arguments are extremely subjective in character, for he has evidently been guided exclusively by impressions when he says that the passage assumes a very rapid degeneration of the Supper of the Lord at Corinth, and that, on the other hand, we ought to hesitate to think that the Christian mystery, as it is expressed in the Pauline conception of the Eucharist, was already constituted in 55 or 56. We ought to add that this Christian mystery is attested by other passages in Paul's writings. Loisy admits this, and enquires whether these verses also may not be interpolations? But he has done so little to prove that they are interpolations that he has not even compiled a list of suspected passages. However great may be our respect for Loisy, and the admiration to which his works entitle him, even from him we cannot accept a theory which is based merely on subjective impressions. Our opinion on the authenticity of certain passages ought not to be dependent on a conception of the development of Christianity; on the contrary, our

historical theory should depend on the teaching of the passages in question.

The text of 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 being recognized as authentic, its exact interpretation depends on two questions. What is the meaning of the formula which introduces this passage: "I have received of the Lord," and what is the relation between the narrative of Paul and that of Mark (xiv. 22-25)?

Many critics conclude from this introductory formula that Paul's narrative originated in a vision, but they are not agreed about the content of this vision. Some believe that the whole story of the Last Supper originated in this way; others, who are less radical, think that by a sort of process of auto-suggestion Paul became able to contemplate in a vision the episode which has been thus preserved in the tradition; others, again, believe that it was not the story of the Last Supper, but the knowledge of the sacramental character of the Eucharist, which arose out of a vision granted to Paul. It has also been suggested that, by a daring process of condensation, in the vision on the road to Damascus Paul has summed up all that he knew of Christ. All these theories are arbitrary, and if we admit that he had a vision it seems difficult to limit the content to certain elements in the narrative. The critics whose opinions we have just mentioned have come too swiftly to the conclusion that Paul was referring to a vision. When the Apostle expounds truths which have been communicated to him in a supernatural manner, that is, when they are "mysteries" in the sense in which he uses this word (for example 1 Cor. xv. 51; Rom. xi. 25), or supernatural revelations, he does not attempt to hide the fact. This simply reinforces the authority of his statements. Why then, in 1 Cor. xi, does he refer so quietly to the authority of the command of which he is reminding the Corinthians? Why does he say: "I have received . . . I have transmitted," which places what he has transmitted and what he has received on exactly the same level?

However, the vision-hypothesis is not absolutely ruled out by these considerations. The question under discussion cannot be solved save by the examination of the character of the narrative and of its relations with other forms of the same tradition. We shall see later that Mark, although he wrote some fifteen years or less after 1 Cor. xi was written, gives an account of the Last Supper of Jesus which corresponds to a stage in the tradition much earlier than the Pauline passage because it was less influenced by liturgical practice. This is a clear proof that Paul did not create the narrative which he gives, but that he owed the substance of it to tradition.

In addition to actual quotations, there are in Paul a fairly large number of allusions to the words of Jesus, sufficient to allow us at least to consider the hypothesis that Paul may have had in his hands an early form of the collection of sayings known as the *Logia*.

Thus the Pauline Epistles furnish very clear evidence to the existence of an historical tradition concerning Jesus. The Apostle gives these hints in too scattered and fragmentary a way for us to be able to attempt to group them once more into a whole. This can be explained, first of all, by the

very fact of the composition of the epistles themselves, and then also by the nature of the Apostle's concern; he did not take the trouble to tell the Gospel story because he was sure that his readers would know at least the elements of it; nor did he try to prove—(what no one doubted)—that Jesus had actually lived, but only that he was the Christ; for this the Jews refused to accept, while the pagans regarded it as “foolishness.”

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

Albert E. Barnett

AUTHORSHIP.—Paul's letters appear to have had no circulation singly outside the localities to which they were originally sent. They came to the attention of the church generally as a published collection. Evidence for their existence usually involves literary reminiscences of from five to nine of the letters and in certain notable instances the full ten-letter corpus. Evidence for the existence and circulation of Ephesians is coextensive with indications of the circulation of Paul's collected letters. Ephesians was clearly a member, and an extremely popular member, of that original corpus. There are no instances down to the beginning of the fourth quarter of the second century where the evidence for an acquaintance with any of Paul's letters does not involve evidence of approximately the same extent and clarity for a literary knowledge of Ephesians.

There was a period of initial popularity for the newly published Pauline letter collection extending from the appearance of Luke-Acts through approximately the first quarter of the second century. There followed, with the emergence of the heretical sects, a quarter of a century when Paul fell into disrepute and his letters into consequent disuse. This eclipse of Paul ended around the middle of the second century. His restoration to prominence as the exemplar and protagonist of orthodoxy was, from the standpoint of the history of early Christian literature, the most important achievement of the latter half of the second century. Throughout this three quarters of a century and more, Ephesians shared the fortunes of the other letters.

The Revelation of John is the earliest witness for the appearance of Paul's published letters. That an apocalypse should have as its introduction a corpus of letters to seven churches, itself with an epistolary preface addressed to the whole church, finds its most reasonable explanation in the predication of an acquaintance with the original form of the published letters of Paul. Those letters had been addressed to seven churches, and when published were prefaced by a general epistle directing the collection to the attention of the church everywhere. Aside from this monumental datum, Revelation reflects a knowledge of the ten letters of the group. Of the ten, Ephesians is most extensively used. The case is identical with the Fourth Gospel, the Ephesian contemporary of Revelation, except for the failure of any reminiscence of Philemon. In such other writings of this early period as First Peter, Hebrews, First Clement, the Johannine epistles,

From *The New Testament: Its Making and Meaning*, New York and Nashville, 1946, pp. 181-86. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.

the epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, all of which show an acquaintance with a majority of Paul's letters, Ephesians rarely falls lower than third in a listing based on the frequency and clearness of the literary reminiscences.

During the period when Paul's letters fell into general disuse in orthodox circles, specific evidence for literary indebtedness to them rarely rises above the level of possibility. Where it exists at all, however, Ephesians is regularly one of the letters possibly known. With the gradual restoration of the letters to currency in the church Ephesians shared the recovery of popularity, although Romans was thereafter the most widely used. The chief witnesses here are Second Peter, the writings of Justin, and the Pastorals. In order of influence as reflected in these writings Ephesians occupies respectively second, third, and fourth places.

The definite ascription of Ephesians to Paul begins with the earliest references to its authorship. Marcion attributed it to Paul and included it in his Pauline canon under the title of Laodiceans. He listed it between Second Thessalonians and Colossians as the seventh letter. Conceivably Marcion exchanged its order with Galatians, which he placed first. He probably gave it the title Laodiceans as an inference from Col. 4:16, since there was no place name in its address. Irenaeus quotes Eph. 5:30 as the words of "the blessed Paul . . . in his letter to the Ephesians." In the Muratorian canon it is known as Ephesians and is listed between Second Corinthians and Philippians as the third of Paul's letters. Thereafter it is regularly known as Ephesians and, until modern times, is regularly regarded as having been written by Paul.

Much in the epistle itself lends support to this external testimony regarding authorship. Paul is twice explicitly named as the author, and other allusions suggest that Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written under identical circumstances and were dispatched by the same messenger. The author's ideas and phraseology bear undeniably strong resemblances to Paul's authentic letters. Such a combination of external and internal evidence would be conclusive were it not for other data in the epistle which argue convincingly for pseudonymity.

Paul habitually wrote to local Christian communities, but Ephesians is by every test an encyclical letter. The *Textus Receptus* has "at Ephesus" as a place name in the address of the epistle and is followed in this reading by our Authorized and Revised versions. The weight of manuscript evidence, however, is against the phrase, and such of the fathers as Origen, Basil, and Jerome did not regard it as original. The text familiar to Marcion evidently lacked it, else he would not have called it Laodiceans. The address fits the body of the epistle better when it is read, "To God's people who are steadfast in Christ Jesus." The encyclical character of Ephesians makes its identification with the period of Paul's career extremely difficult and lends probability to its location in the last decade of the first century.

The literary indebtedness of Ephesians to the other nine letters generally attributed to Paul makes its authenticity unlikely. Variety and originality of expression rather than repetitiousness characterize those letters. The different character of Ephesians in this respect definitely sets it apart.

Its derivative character is especially clear by comparison with Colossians, which it so largely incorporates, but the influence of all nine of the letters is observable in its imagery and language. This becomes doubly impressive when the author's own distinctive emphases, themselves essentially un-Pauline, are nevertheless expressed in forms of speech borrowed from Paul's genuine letters. The author apparently restricted himself to materials found in Paul's letters even though he addressed his message to a post-Pauline situation. The relationship of Ephesians to those letters has its best analogy in the Fourth Gospel. Ephesians and the Fourth Gospel are both expositions of selected Pauline insights for the needs of a later situation in the church.

As its literary dependence on Paul's letters suggested, the historical situation reflected in the epistle is more nearly that of the last decade of the century than that of the period of Paul's missionary career. The author is as definitely non-Jewish as his reading public. Moreover, author and readers have no personal knowledge of one another. The author's written message is the only basis of acquaintance between himself and his readers. The apostles are idealized as in Luke-Acts and Revelation, and Paul is implicitly numbered among them. In contrast with Paul, for whom Christ alone was the foundation of the church and, as the Spirit, the agent of revelation, the apostles are here regarded as the "foundation," and the church is itself viewed as the channel of revelation. The epistle furthermore exhibits an awareness of the existence of heretical sects and a sense of their menace to the unity of the church hardly reconcilable with Paul's outlook. Such data suggest rather clearly the situation around the close of the century.

These characteristics within the epistle itself radically reduce if they do not eliminate the probability of Pauline authorship. They lend plausibility, however, to the suggestion that Onesimus collected Paul's letters and in his name wrote Ephesians as a sort of prefatory exposition of their substance to commend them to the entire church. This identification of the author explains the heavy indebtedness of Ephesians to Colossians and the inclusion of Philemon among Paul's published letters. Nor was there another associate of Paul who would more appropriately acknowledge his profound personal indebtedness by writing in the apostle's name. If the Onesimus of whom Paul wrote so affectionately in Philemon was later the bishop of the Ephesian church whom Ignatius described as "a man of inexpressible love" and a stalwart opponent of heresy, he fits the data of Ephesians doubly well, and the ascription of the epistle to him becomes an invaluable aid in its interpretation.

The First Readers.—There was no place name in the original address of Ephesians. Nor does the sense of the address require the designation of a local community. It is entirely intelligible when read, "To God's people who are steadfast in Christ Jesus." The title "To the Ephesians" may be a reminiscence of the fact that the epistle was written at Ephesus in connection with the publication of Paul's letters there. The collector of the letters, however, had no reason for giving the epistle this or any other title. Not until the time of Irenaeus was the epistle known as Ephesians.

The designation conceivably originated as an editorial conjecture based on the location of Tychicus at Ephesus in the recently published Pastoral epistles.

The address harmonizes with the encyclical character of the epistle. Neither allusions nor personal greetings suggest a local group among whom the author might once have lived and worked. Author and readers appear rather to have been personally unknown to each other. The closing mention of Tychicus is an isolated variation from the rule of indefiniteness and serves to emphasize rather than alter the impression that the readers were Christians in general. It sounds very much like the similar references to Timothy in Heb. 13:23 and to Silvanus and Mark in 1 Pet. 5:12. In all probability the allusion was part of the literary disguise.

The reading public contemplated in the epistle was entirely Greek. Both author and audience were non-Jewish. That there were once Jewish Christians is taken for granted; chronologically they had been "the first to believe in Christ." But they now belong to a relatively remote past and are viewed objectively as a group with whom the contemporary Christian community sustains no living contacts. The conclusion to which these data rather clearly point is that Ephesians was an encyclical epistle designed for publication and for general circulation among Gentile Christians, who at this time almost entirely composed the membership of the church.

[CRITICAL PROBLEMS RELATED TO GALATIANS]

George S. Duncan

GALATIANS is happily free from some of the critical difficulties which confront us in certain other N.T. writings.

(a) Its *authenticity* is unquestioned. In every line it betrays its origin as a genuine letter of Paul. It was unchallenged in the second century by the heretic Marcion, as it was in the nineteenth by the negative criticism of the Tübingen School.

(b) Neither is there any doubt regarding its *unity*. It came "red-hot" from the apostle in the form in which we to-day have it.

But in other respects it is the most tantalizingly difficult of all Paul's letters. Three problems in particular arouse great diversity of opinion among scholars.

1. The destination of the Epistle. Who were the Galatians?
2. The date and occasion of writing.
3. The source of the trouble in Galatia, and the character of Paul's opponents.

These three problems necessarily hang together, and our solution of any one will to some extent determine, and be determined by, our solution of the others. No attempt can be made here to touch on all their varied aspects. In the present commentary special attention is given to the second problem, and if the solution proposed for it be accepted, viz. that the Epistle was written before the Apostolic Council of Acts xv., all doubt is removed regarding its destination, and considerable light is shed on the precise nature of the controversy that occasioned it.

1. THE DESTINATION OF THE EPISTLE

In the heart of the peninsula which to-day we call Asia Minor there dwelt a Celtic people who, coming originally from Gaul, had preserved the name Galatians. When Rome spread her conquests eastwards, this wild people retained the status of a dependent kingdom (189 B.C.); a century and a half later the country passed into various hands, and ultimately in 25 B.C. came to be governed under the Roman provincial system. At the time of Paul the province which went under the name of Galatia included the old kingdom of Galatia to the north, and also parts of Lycaonia, Pisidia and Phrygia which adjoined it to the south.

The problem therefore emerges: when Paul refers to Galatia, is he thinking in a restricted sense of *the old kingdom* of Galatia—which, for

From *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary), London, 1934, pp. xviii-xxxii. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Hodder & Stoughton.

convenience' sake, we may call North Galatia? Or does Galatia mean for him *the Roman province* of that name? If the former, we have no detailed information from Acts of any missionary work carried on in that region, the only possible references (and it may even be questioned whether they refer to North Galatia at all) being the mention of the place-name in Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23, in the accounts of the second and third missionary journeys. On the other hand, if Paul is thinking of the Roman province, it becomes possible for us to hold that the Galatian churches are in the southern part of the province, viz. the churches of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, which were founded by Barnabas and Paul on their first missionary journey.

Thus we have the two hypotheses—the North Galatian and the South Galatian. And inasmuch as the Galatian churches would appear from the references in the Epistle to have been all founded at one and the same time, these two hypotheses are mutually exclusive. The churches to which Paul writes were *either* those in South Galatia, founded on the first missionary journey, *or* they were in North Galatia, founded apparently on the second journey. To this we may add that while we have a fair amount of information from Acts regarding the South Galatian churches, we are almost completely in the dark regarding the alleged visits to the northern area. Did Paul penetrate, we may ask, as far into the interior as Ancyra or even Tavium, or did he (as seems a more reasonable hypothesis) go no further than Pessinus and neighbourhood? No towns are mentioned by name, and nothing is said about the founding of churches.

Among the ancients it was accepted without question that the Galatians of our Epistle were the inhabitants of North Galatia, and until comparatively recent years this was still the predominant view. But during the nineteenth century it began to be seriously challenged. Advocated seventy years ago by Perrot and Renan, the South Galatian theory must now for ever be associated with the name of Sir William Ramsay, who, bringing to its support his wide and intimate knowledge of the geographical and political conditions of Asia Minor in the Graeco-Roman period, has by his numerous contributions to the subject presented the case in so masterly and cogent a fashion that (in the words of so cautious a scholar even as the late Professor C. H. Turner) he has "swept the opposing theory from the field."

Nevertheless there are still many eminent scholars, e.g. Moffatt, Lietzmann, Lagrange, who either accept the North Galatian theory wholeheartedly or indicate a preference for it. If the destination of the Epistle could be discussed as an isolated problem, perhaps the fairest verdict would be *non liquet*. The present writer inclines strongly to the South Galatian hypothesis, but he does so largely because on that hypothesis we can reach, as he believes, a far more satisfactory exegesis of the Epistle, and, in particular, because the early date to which he feels compelled to assign the Epistle rules out the North Galatian theory as impossible.

One or two minor questions of interest may be referred to before we leave this part of our enquiry.

(i) It is by no means so certain as Ramsay sought to make out that

the references in Acts xvi. and xviii. exclude a visit to some part of North Galatia. But even if that be conceded, it does not follow that it was to converts made on those two occasions that Paul writes in the Epistle. Thus Burton, the editor of the *International Critical Commentary* on Galatians, is willing to believe that "on his second missionary journey Paul passed through the western edge of old Galatia, there finding or making a few disciples but founding no churches," but he holds nevertheless that it was to the churches in South Galatia that Paul addressed his Epistle.

(ii) The references to Barnabas in the Epistle (ii. 1, 9, 13) suggest that he was in some way known to the recipients, and they would have added significance if he was known to them personally (cf. especially the pregnant reference "even Barnabas"). But it was only in South Galatia, i.e. on the first missionary journey, that Barnabas was associated with Paul; by the time of the visits to North Galatia, Barnabas and he had parted company. . . .

(iii) Is it likely, we may ask, that there would have been a special outburst of Judaistic propaganda in North Galatia? If, as is generally accepted, the Judaizers came from outside (from Jerusalem, probably), had they passed by South Galatia, where there were organized churches, to go on to North Galatia, where probably there were at most only small bands of believers? Lagrange deduces from the Epistle that the people to whom it was addressed had until now been outside the range of Judaistic controversies; but the true explanation of this is not that they dwelt in a remote part of Asia, untouched by the great trade-routes, but that the Epistle was written at an early date when Judaistic propaganda was only beginning.

(iv) Paul addresses his readers directly: "O senseless Galatians"; and it is sometimes urged that it would have been foolish and unnatural for him to use this mode of address to people who, though they were Galatians for purposes of administration, were certainly not Galatians by birth. The objection is by no means convincing. There was no other comprehensive designation for the wide varieties of nationality to be found in the southern area of the province; and it may even have been a designation which would have evoked a sense of pride.

2. THE DATE AND OCCASION OF WRITING

If, as seems the natural interpretation of iv. 13, the apostle had paid *two visits* to the Galatian churches, then on the N. Galatian theory the epistle was not written till some time after the visit of Acts xviii. 23—i.e. it cannot have been written before his ministry in Ephesus (Acts xix.).

On the S. Galatian theory, on the other hand, the second visit may either be that referred to in Acts xvi. 6, or (to go further back) it may be equated with the return visit on the first missionary journey (Acts xiv. 21). A more precise dating requires that we determine whether the Epistle was written very soon after the completion of the first missionary journey, or at some time during (or subsequent to) the second missionary journey.

Put otherwise, the question is: was it written before or after the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem of Acts xv.?

Is the visit to Jerusalem in Galatians ii. 1-10 to be identified with that in Acts xv. or with that in Acts xi. 30?

The Epistle must clearly be later than the latest event recorded in it; and as criticism for long maintained, with scarcely a dissentient voice, that Paul's second visit to Jerusalem recorded in Gal. ii. was obviously the same as the one paid at the time of the Council of Acts xv., it was regarded as established beyond cavil that Galatians was later than the Council. Another view, however, which has of late found increasing support in Britain and America (it has been adopted by Ramsay, Streeter, Burkitt, and is the view maintained in this Commentary) is that the visit of Gal. ii. corresponds to the visit narrated in Acts xi. 30, when Barnabas and Paul went up with a contribution from the Christians in Antioch to relieve distress among the Jewish-Christians of Jerusalem. If this second view is established, it becomes possible on the S. Galatian theory (it may even be said that it becomes essential) to date Galatians before the Apostolic Council, when the apostle paid a third visit to Jerusalem. On this view Galatians is earlier than the Thessalonian Epistles, which were not written till the second missionary journey. It becomes, in fact, the earliest of all the Pauline Epistles.

Those who identify Gal. ii. with Acts xv. find their initial (and in the end their main) justification in the alleged similarity in the circumstances of the two visits. In each case we have Barnabas and Paul consulting with the Jerusalem leaders on the question of the admission of Gentiles to the Christian Fellowship, and in each case they win their way in the face of vehement opposition. But the resemblances can be overstressed; there are differences which are even more striking than the resemblances; and with regard to the visit of Acts xi. 30 it may be claimed that there too we have Barnabas and Paul going up to Jerusalem, and that what we know about that visit makes it certainly not impossible (but rather, as we shall see, makes it probable) that it provides the true setting for the events of Gal. ii. 1-10.

Objections to identifying Gal. ii. with Acts xv.

(1) At the outset there is this fact to which due weight must be given. If there is one passage more than another in his Epistles where Paul is stating unchallengeable facts, it is in Gal. i. and ii. Faced with bitter misrepresentations regarding his relations with the Jerusalem "authorities" he sets himself to state his case with a fearless regard for accuracy and truth. "I am writing you the sheer truth, I swear it before God!" he says in i. 20. He begins by telling how, some three years after his conversion, he went up to Jerusalem from Damascus—an account which agrees in general with that given in Acts ix. Then "after fourteen years," he says, "I went up again to Jerusalem along with Barnabas." Thus what is the *second* visit to Jerusalem in the narrative of Galatians, where every sentence is carefully

weighed, is to be identified (say the critics) with a visit which in Acts is the *third* visit. The discrepancy is so serious that one would have thought that the obvious solution was to discard the premise which gives rise to it, in other words to abandon the identification of Gal. ii. with Acts xv. If, however, that identification is to be maintained, how is the discrepancy to be accounted for? The explanations put forward have assumed three main forms, no one of which can be regarded as satisfactory.

(a) We pass over the drastic solution, rarely now put forward, that the visit described in Acts xi. 30 is unhistorical.

(b) A second explanation is that Paul omits all reference to the visit of Acts xi. 30 because on that occasion he saw only the presbyters, not the apostles. This is a mere evasion of the difficulty. Even if it be conceded that Paul's concern in Galatians is to tell, not of his *visits to Jerusalem*, but of his *relations with the apostles*, is it conceivable that he would in such a narrative have omitted altogether to mention the intervening visit, when in a few words he could have safeguarded himself by saying that on that occasion the apostles were not present in the city? Further we may doubt whether the fact that only the presbyters are mentioned in the Acts narrative means that the apostles were certainly absent.

(c) A third explanation, maintained by Schwartz and McGiffert and now adopted by Kirsopp Lake, is that in Acts xi. 30 and Acts xv. we have the same visit narrated from two different points of view, owing to the author's dependence on different sources. Thus Acts is made to conform to Galatians in having only two visits; the Apostolic Council, which took place on the second of these, is dated at the same time as the famine-relief visit (possibly as early as the year 46); and just as there are two versions of the one visit to Jerusalem, so also there are two versions of the one mission to Galatia (i), in Acts xiii. and xiv. and (ii) in Acts xvi. 6 ff. Whatever attractiveness such a hypothesis may have as a critical *tour de force*, we can have no confidence that it is *true*; and is it not at once more reasonable and more satisfactory to accept the general outline of Acts as we have it?

(2) A further objection to seeing in Gal. ii. 1-10 Paul's version of the narrative of Acts xv. is that the two accounts do not harmonize.

(a) In Acts there is a formal conference; in Galatians Paul has a private interview with the Jerusalem leaders.

(b) At the Council in Acts decrees are passed which are embodied in a letter to be sent down to the churches concerned. Paul in Galatians makes no reference to decrees, and indeed makes it plain that no decrees were passed. "The authorities," he says, "made no addition to my gospel, they fully acknowledged my apostleship, and merely asked me to remember the poor" (ii. 6-10). This is not the place to examine the various problems raised by the narrative in Acts xv.—how far e.g. is that account reliable, what were the exact terms of the decision, and did it represent a compromise or a complete endorsement of Paul's Gentile-policy? But unless we are to dismiss it as completely unreliable, then in any attempt to identify the two accounts we are faced with the baffling question: "Why, if a formal ruling on the situation was arrived at, is there no reference to it in the

Epistle?" Surely the Judaizers would readily have appealed to it if it had represented a compromise; or if it represented a triumph for Paul, the apostle had only to refer to it to silence all controversy. No satisfactory explanation of this difficulty has yet been forthcoming.

(3) A third objection to the identification of Gal. ii. and Acts xv. is provided by the narrative in Gal. ii. 11 ff., regarding the question of Jewish and Gentile Christians eating together at Antioch. One naturally assumes that the episode related in those verses took place *after* the events related in verses 1-10. But how could a difficulty such as is there described have developed if verses 1-10 represent a formal conference at which this very difficulty had already been discussed and settled?

It may be urged that this is scarcely a fair statement of the case. The Apostolic Council, it may be said, dealt solely with the terms on which Gentiles could have a place in the Christian Fellowship, not with the question of Jewish and Gentile Christians associating with one another. But is it conceivable that at the date of the Council, when (according to the evidence of Acts) the work at Antioch had been going on for perhaps three years and there had been a Gentile-embracing mission through South Galatia, the question of the admission of Gentiles *into* the Fellowship could be discussed as an isolated question apart from the other question of the corporate relations of Jews and Gentiles *within* the Fellowship? This practical issue must certainly have presented itself to the Council. Accordingly, if Gal. ii. 1-10 is a narrative of the Council, critics are driven to suggest that the incident of Peter at Antioch in verses 11 ff. took place *before* the events described in verses 1-10. In other words, Paul relates first of all his two visits to Jerusalem, and then goes back to recount an incident at Antioch which took place before the second of these. Such a reversal of chronological order, of which there is not a hint in Paul's narrative, is so highly improbable that only as a last expedient ought it to be accepted as an explanation.

.
Doctrinal features of the Epistle, and their bearing on the question of date

Even if we accept Galatians as the earliest of all his letters, we must not forget that at this date Paul had already been a Christian for perhaps seventeen years, and in its essential features his gospel was already formed. But as at least *pointers* in the direction of an early date we may cite the character of his references to the Church and the fact that, though he comes so near to it in thought, he never uses the expression "the body of Christ." Similarly, he does not use the term "the mystery" with regard to the Gospel, even though all that is implied by that phrase in Col. i. 25 ff. is already present to his mind. The simple expression . . . "those who belong to Christ" (lit. "who are of Christ" . . .) has a parallel in the name "Christ's men" (*Christianoi*) which about this time came to be applied to the believers at Antioch (Acts xi. 26).

The thought which Paul develops in his later Epistles, that believers

share in the Lord's risen life, is not expressed in that way in Galatians, where the benefits of salvation are connected with Christ's redemptive death and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Paul's apocalyptic teaching in the Thessalonian Epistles (written during the second missionary journey) is certainly not to be explained as representing a cruder and a more primitive stage in his religious thinking. And as regards the affinities of our Epistle with Romans, which dates from the third missionary journey, it is entirely fallacious to imagine that these necessarily imply that Romans (at least in its present form) and Galatians were written at approximately the same time.

Chronology

On the obscure subject of chronology a word must suffice. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30; Gal. ii. 1') may be connected, as Acts indicates, with a famine in Judaea. On the evidence of Josephus there was a famine in Judaea about the year 46—after the death of Herod in 44. A probable date for the Apostolic Council (Acts xv.) is 48, which may therefore be taken also as the date of our Epistle. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem, approximately fourteen years before the second visit, may be placed about 33, and his conversion two years earlier.

[THE PAULINE CORPUS]

Burnett H. Streeter

SOME MUCH DEBATED questions in regard to the epistles to Timothy and Titus will become clearer if we first consider an analogous literary problem. Somewhere about the year A.D. 360 an unknown ecclesiastic—it would seem from his style that he is identical with the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions*—took upon himself to produce an enlarged and (in his own judgment) an improved edition of the epistles of Ignatius. The seven genuine letters he amplified with edifying matter, appropriate to the needs of his own time; and he composed five additional letters. Fortunately there survives a single Greek manuscript (and a Latin translation) of the letters in their original form; and as in the *Apostolic Constitutions* we have a quite other work in which to study the style and methods of this enterprising editor, we are in a position to ascertain the exact state of affairs in regard to the Ignatian letters.

This re-editing of Ignatius was done in the fourth century; but the same sort of thing could happen in the second. No one can read side by side the epistle of Jude and chapter ii. of the second epistle of Peter, so-called, without perceiving that in these two documents the same things are being said in very much the same words. There can be no reasonable doubt that the author of 2 Peter has, with slight verbal alterations, incorporated practically the whole of the older epistle of Jude. What he found in Jude, along with what he added himself, seemed to comprise “a tract for the times” so vitally needed that—feeling sure Peter, if alive, would have taken that line—he deemed it justifiable to gain for it wide and immediate publicity by putting at the head of it the name of the Apostle.

It has long been thought that the epistles to Timothy and Titus, in the form in which we have them, are the result of a similar process of editing. If any doubt still remained, it has been removed by the brilliant study of Dr. P. N. Harrison. It seems clear that 2 Timothy embodies several authentic letters of the Apostle—these being short notes, similar to many, only a few lines in length, that have been discovered among the papyrus finds in Egypt. Titus concludes with one such; but 1 Timothy would seem to be entirely the composition of the editor. The epistles in their present form appear to have been known both to Polycarp in Smyrna and to Ignatius in Antioch by A.D. 115; hence they can hardly be later than A.D. 110. The evidence, therefore, which they afford in regard to Church Order must be taken as

From *The Primitive Church*, New York, 1929, pp. 107-21. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The Macmillan Company.

evidence as to the state of things in the church in which they were produced at about that date, rather than as evidence for the Apostolic Age.

That the church in and for which the editor worked was in the province of Asia we may conjecture with some confidence. Most probably he worked in Ephesus itself.

(1) Two out of the three letters, and those the longest, purport to be addressed to Timothy while resident at Ephesus; and the editor is concerned to make a good deal of Timothy's connection with Ephesus. Thus the first epistle opens with a reminder to Timothy of a previous occasion in which he had been left by Paul to take charge of this church; and as nothing is said in this epistle about the Apostle being in prison, while he twice expresses an intention of coming to Ephesus in person, the author evidently intends the epistle to be read as if written, either when Paul was at liberty, or in the earlier stages of his imprisonment when he still anticipated release. The second epistle to Timothy, on the other hand, is represented as written when the Apostle is in prison, and expecting death. But Timothy is still at Ephesus—as appears from the fact that salutations are sent to the house of Onesiphorus (2 Tim. iv. 19), who earlier in the letter (2 Tim. i. 16-18) is identified as having come to Rome from Ephesus.

(2) The editor names certain persons whom he thinks should be treated as especially dangerous heretics—Hymenaeus, Alexander, and Philetus (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 17). We know the names of a large number of early heretics; but of the above none is ever heard of elsewhere. Their importance, we infer, must have been purely local. Our editor would never have singled out these persons, and these only, for special execration unless he wrote in a locality where they were well known and had a considerable following. Since, then, they are represented as among the most serious enemies whom Timothy would have to face in Ephesus, it is a fair presumption that the epistles were written in, and primarily for, the Church in Asia.

If the editor wrote in Ephesus not later than A.D. 110, we may accept it as an historical fact, preserved by local tradition, that Timothy had been either left in Ephesus by Paul, or subsequently sent there by him. We know that he had been sent on analogous missions to Corinth and to Philippi.

For this cause have I sent unto you Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, even as I teach everywhere in every church (1 Cor. iv. 17 f.).

Our editor's representation of the character of Timothy, his relations with the Apostle, and the nature of his mission, has obviously been influenced by this passage, as well as by the similar notice in Philippians (ii. 19-24). The Apostle's repeated promise that he will follow up Timothy's visit with one by himself (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15; iv. 13) is clearly an echo of the similar promises in 1 Cor. iv. 19 and Phil. ii. 24. Similarly the injunction, "Let no man despise thy youth" (1 Tim. iv. 12), is evidently an exegetical comment on "Let no man therefore despise him" (1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11)—a mistaken

exegesis, it should be noted, since Timothy cannot have been a very young man at this date.

It is possible that, after the death of Paul, Timothy settled permanently in Ephesus. In that case the mantle of Elijah would have descended upon Elisha, and Timothy would have virtually stepped into the place of Paul, and found himself in a position of acknowledged supremacy over other officers of the local church. He would, in fact if not in name, have at once become bishop, in the monarchical sense, of that city—with, in addition, a kind of patriarchal jurisdiction over all other churches in the province. It is more probable that after a time Timothy resumed the life of a wandering "Evangelist"; or possibly he did settle and become virtually Bishop of Ephesus, but did not hold the position long. We hear of him once at a later date as being in prison; and on his release he may have had to leave Asia (Heb. xiii. 23).

What happened to Timothy is a matter of conjecture; but there is clear evidence that later on, precisely from the lack of wise and trustworthy leaders, the church at Ephesus passed through stormy times.

I know that after my departing, grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them. . . . I coveted no man's silver or gold, or apparel. Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. In all things I gave you an example (Acts xx. 29-30, 33-35).

How far these are the exact words spoken by the Apostle to the Ephesian episcopoi may be disputed (about himself he says something very like this in 1 Thess. ii. 3-12); what is certain is that they would never have appeared at the central point of emphasis in Paul's farewell address, unless the author of Acts had known that in after years this church had suffered, not only from heretical teaching, but also from the venality and domineering spirit of its officers. And the language used is far more intelligible if the church was ruled by a group of officers of co-equal power, than by one single individual, who might have been held more or less responsible for what his subordinates taught and did. Other evidence points in the same direction. From Colossians we see that, even within the lifetime of St. Paul, Gnosticism, of an early type, was beginning to invade the church in Asia. In 1 John we hear of "many Antichrists" who "went out from us, but they were not of us"; such "going out" implies a previous struggle; "many" implies heretics of more than one type. There is also the allusion to the teaching (probably of Cerinthus) that Christ did not really suffer on the Cross (1 John v. 6). I comment later on the hint in 1 Peter, coinciding with the passage quoted above from Acts, that there was serious moral failure in some of the church officials—otherwise what need to exhort the Presbyters to keep clear of "filthy lucre" and of "lording it over" the flock of Christ? (1 Peter v. 2 f.).

The iniquities of church officers are vigorously denounced in one of the ancient sources—believed to date from the first century—embodied in the *Ascension of Isaiah*.

In those days many will love office, though devoid of wisdom. And there will be many lawless elders, and shepherds dealing wrongly by their own sheep, and they will ravage (them) owing to their not having holy shepherds. . . . And there will not be in those days many prophets, nor those who speak trustworthy words, save one here and there in divers places. On account of the spirit of error and fornication and of vain-glory, and of covetousness, which shall be in those who will be called servants of that One and in those who will receive that One. And there will be great hatred in the shepherds and elders towards each other (iii. 23-27).

In the same document, but in another context, there is an obscure phrase which seems to imply that at the time of writing there were, though few", still *some* alive, who had seen the Lord in the flesh. We know that two such, Aristion and the Elder John, survived in Asia till late in the first century; and the evidence of Acts and 1 Peter suggests that in Asia the clergy earlier than elsewhere acquired considerable power, and frequently abused it. On the other hand, if the *Didache* be taken as evidence for the state of affairs in Syria at this date, it would seem that in that province the Episcopoi and Deacons had too little authority (p. 150 ff.). I infer that the document represented by this section of the *Ascension of Isaiah* probably originated in Asia. If so, it casts a flood of light on the situation there.

It would look as if in the Church of that date—as has sometimes happened in the State, ancient and modern—a situation was developing such that the autocratic rule of an individual seemed the only alternative to disintegration of the society. We may surmise that in Ephesus the situation was saved by the Elder John. In that case the memory of the period or periods in which Timothy, as the accredited representative of the Apostle, had kept the church true to the ideal of a Christian community, would have been the precedent everywhere quoted by the party who supported the concentration of power in the hands of a single individual; so that, in effect, John (and other local bishops) inherited in permanency the position once temporarily held by Timothy.

But whatever may have been the history of the emergence in Ephesus of the monarchical episcopate, the case of Diotrephes shows that it already existed in some churches of Asia by the end of the first century. In Asia, mon-episcopacy *antedates* the writing of the Pastoral Epistles. We shall, then, make nonsense of the evidence they afford as to Church Order, unless we study them with this fact in mind. It will then appear that what the author has in mind is, not advocacy of one type of church government rather than another, but the moral level of its *personelle*.

It was pointed out long ago by Jerome and by several of the Greek fathers, that there is no passage in the New Testament which compels the assumption that the terms "Episcopos" and "Presbyter" are the names of two different offices. We remember that the leaders of the church at Ephesus summoned to Miletus (Acts xx. 17-28) are styled "Presbyters" but are addressed by Paul as "Episcopoi"; while in the Pauline church of Philippi the officers saluted are Episcopoi and Deacons. And so far as the

actual use of the word *Episcopos* is concerned, there is nothing in the Pastorals to show that this usage has changed. Titus is instructed

to appoint elders in every city . . . if any man is blameless . . . for the bishops must be blameless . . . (Tit. i. 5-7).

Again, when the duties and qualifications of particular offices are being defined (1 Tim. iii. 1-13) the *Episcopos*, Deacons and "women" (apparently Deaconesses) are mentioned, but not Presbyters. The word "*episcopos*" is in the singular; but both passages read most naturally if this is taken as the generic singular, which is quite compatible with there being several officers bearing that name in each church.

Harnack and others argue that these passages—the only two in which the word *Episcopos* occurs—are early interpolations. But in neither case is the connection of thought in the context really improved if they are struck out. Thus the paragraph 1 Tim. ii. 1-15 is concerned with the conduct of public worship; it is immediately followed by the section 1 Tim. iii. 1-13, which deals with the qualifications required in a person to be appointed to the office of bishop or deacon. The writer then goes on to say:

These things write I unto thee . . . that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the House of God, which is the Church of the living God (1 Tim. iii. 14-15).

In the English version this reads like an injunction as to decorum in public worship; but in Greek the word "house" in this context would suggest the idea of organisation and management. It is, therefore, more appropriate after a paragraph dealing with Church Order, than after one concerned with the conduct of worship.

There is more to be said for the view that the passage in Titus is an interpolation. The paragraph (Tit. i. 10), "For there are many unruly men . . .", follows admirably on the conclusion of i. 6, "who are not accused of riot or unruly", if the intervening verses (in which the word "*episcopos*" occurs) are struck out. But this also makes quite good sense where it stands, and it is quite in the style of the author of the rest of the epistle.

Even if these passages be regarded as genuine, there is not much in the way of direct reference in the Pastorals to church organisation *as such*; and what little there is seems ambiguous—designedly ambiguous, I suggest. The reference to

the elders that rule well . . . especially those who labour in the word and teaching (1 Tim. v. 17),

would be appropriate to a church ruled by a body of *Episcopoi* who, as in the other usage, could be spoken of under the generic name of Presbyters. But it would equally have point in a church in which a single *Episcopos* held a position superior to other Presbyters who yet enjoyed subordinate powers of discipline. Again, the allusion to the spiritual gift conferred by "the laying on of hands of the Presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14) would be

appropriate whichever way the church was governed; for even to the present day priests are associated with the bishop in the laying on of hands at ordinations.

What more likely than that the author, writing for a district where most—but not as yet all—churches had a monarchical bishop, should preserve a studious ambiguity. He could do so, since the discussion of church organisation is *not* the main purpose of his epistles. Controversy about primitive Church Order has largely raged round the interpretation of the Pastoral epistles; again, the only two passages which name “the bishop” do so as “the husband of one wife”—and this lends them to modern ears a faint absurdity and picturesqueness which makes them stick in the memory. Thus it has come about that among scholars and divines it is more or less taken for granted that the Pastoral epistles as a whole are primarily concerned with church organization. But if they are read apart from these two sections, there results a very different impression of the author’s main aim. His purpose is then seen to be, not so much ecclesiastical, as moral; that is to say, he is not primarily concerned with advocating a particular type of Church Order, but with exhorting the persons who actually hold office to live worthily of their high responsibilities. He is not concerned to make out that the monarchical episcopate existed in Ephesus in the lifetime of the Apostles; he was doubtless aware that it did not. What he is concerned to do is to urge the rulers of the churches of his own time—in Ephesus and elsewhere—to exercise their office with the diligence, tact, and sense of a sacred responsibility, that persons like Timothy and Titus displayed in the exercise of analogous, though not quite identical, functions in the Apostolic Age. It was not the form of church government, but the character of those who held office, which was disquieting the Church at this period.

The moral problems of any church differ from age to age much less than the theological. Hence it will not be entirely irrelevant to cite the Pionian *Life of Polycarp* as evidence of the way in which the moral emphasis in these epistles struck the early church. The passage to be cited is also relevant as evidence, if not of the primitive method of appointing a bishop, yet of that practised in Asia, perhaps already in the second century.

And on the Sabbath, when prayer had been made long time on bended knee [Polycarp], as was his custom, got up to read; and every eye was fixed upon him. Now the lesson was the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and to Titus, in which he says what manner of man a bishop ought to be. And he was so well fitted for the office that the hearers said one to another that he lacked none of those qualities which Paul requires in one who has the care of a church. When, then (after the reading, and the instruction of the bishops and the discourses of the presbyters) the deacons were sent to the laity to enquire whom they would have, they said with one accord, “Let Polycarp be our pastor and preacher”. The whole priesthood then having assented, they appointed him, notwithstanding his earnest entreaties and his desires to decline.

Accordingly the deacons led him up for ordination by the hands of the bishops according to custom. And being placed in his chair by them, he moistened and anointed first with tears of piety and humility the place where in the spirit he saw standing the feet of Christ who was present with him for the anointing to the priestly office.

For where the ministers are—the priests and Levites—there in the midst is also the High-priest arrayed in the great flowing robe. Then the company present urged him, since this was the custom, to address them. For they said that this work of teaching was the most important part of the communion (*Life of Polycarp*, § 22-23).

Then follows a brief sermon, in the course of which, it is interesting to note, the Pastoral epistles are again alluded to.

This office exceeds my powers; for I well know that no man could fulfil it well, except that he hath just received it from the Lord from heaven, as the blessed Paul has shown in his epistles, showing in a single word the whole life of one who is appointed to office, when he speaks of it as "blameless".

Of the practical advice given to Timothy in the Pastorals the larger part is pointless except as given to persons in a position to exercise a virtually supreme authority. Timothy and Titus are historical individuals, and are represented as having such authority delegated to them by the Apostle who writes the letters; but the actual letters are the work of one who wrote years after these two distinguished personages were dead. The question, then, which the historian must ask himself is, What was the motive of the editor of the Pastorals in developing all this elaborate advice as to how an individual in supreme charge of a church was to order his own life and that of the community? Clearly, such advice would have point only if at the time of writing (at any rate in some churches) individuals existed who were in a position to carry it out.

The author of the Pastorals, we infer, takes the monarchical episcopate for granted. To him the figures of Timothy and Titus are of interest, not as historical personages, but as affording him an opportunity of portraying two different types of the ideal bishop. Timothy is the ideal bishop in his relation to his own church in a province like Ephesus, where organised churches already existed in all the principal towns. Titus, on the other hand, is the ideal of the Missionary Bishop—the bishop of some outlying province, where the churches outside the bishop's own headquarters are weak and disorganized. That is why in the epistle to Titus rather more stress is laid on church organisation as such. But, though mentioned first, this subject is still treated as one of which the actual details may be taken as a matter of established tradition.

Clement of Alexandria quotes a story about the Apostle John and a convert who became a robber chief and was re-converted. He may have got this from the *Acts of John*; but Clement tells us he had lived in Ionia—the ancient name for the coast cities of Asia—and he implies that he got it from oral tradition; and his incidental remark, "a certain city . . . whose very name is told by some", seems to imply divergencies in the tradition unlikely to be found in a written source. If so, the story stands on a different footing from the narratives derived by various fathers from the *Acts of John*. But if we may take leave to assume that the story is in the main historical, but should be told, not of the Apostle John but of the Elder, we get a picture of his activities on a more extended scale.

He went also, when invited, from Ephesus to the neighbouring regions of the Gentiles: in some to appoint bishops, in some to institute entire new churches, and in others to appoint to the ministry some one of those that were pointed out by the Holy Ghost.

Now the procedure here attributed to John is exactly that ascribed to Titus in the epistle addressed to him.

But why, we ask, are not similar duties in regard to the smaller cities of the province assigned to Timothy, whose headquarters is Ephesus? Timothy and Titus are character sketches of the ideal bishop. But by the time the Pastorals were written mon-episcopacy would seem to have been established in all or most of the cities of Asia. And these bishops may have been a trifle jealous of their rights as against the See of Ephesus. Even John the Elder may have found it more difficult than he had anticipated to bring Diotrephes to heel. In the days of John's successor, who necessarily lacked the prestige of being a disciple of the Lord, it was more tactful not to raise this question. Timothy and Titus are painted as models of the ideal bishop; but it was perhaps safer not to suggest that the one of them who was stationed at Ephesus exercised in regard to neighbouring cities duties and authority which pertained to the bishops of provincial capitals in more backward provinces.

But, it may be objected, the Timothy of the Pastorals is not permanently at Ephesus; his residence there is temporary, "Till I come" (1 Tim. iv. 13). To this I reply that the facts about Timothy's stay in Ephesus were well known and could not be otherwise represented. But if we examine the instructions given him, it is clear that they are not at all of an emergency character; they are appropriate only if given to a person who has both the responsibilities and the difficulties of a man in supreme charge of a great church *over a period of years*. He is told that the example of a good life is to be relied on, quite as much as steady sound teaching, to counteract heresy (1 Tim. iv. 12); that a body of "faithful men" is to be trained up to hand on to others the true doctrine (2 Tim. ii), and so on. The epistles might be entitled, "Advices to those who are, or who aspire to become, Bishops". And the advice is exactly what we should expect of an author who wrote *after* the monarchical episcopate had been established in Ephesus and the principal towns of the neighborhood. He wrote to supply what the time needed; and what the time needed was, not a defence of episcopacy, but good bishops.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF 2 THESSALONIANS

Kirsopp C. Lake

EVER SINCE the modern criticism of the Pauline Epistles began, this letter has been one of those as to the authenticity of which it has been most generally conceded by impartial scholars that there is legitimate room for doubt, and though the tide of opinion has ebbed and flowed, there has never been any practical unanimity, such as has been reached in favour of 1 Thessalonians. . . . The main arguments against the Pauline authorship may be reduced to two: (1) the view that the Apocalyptic passage in the second chapter refers to events later than the life of St. Paul, or is inconsistent with the eschatological teaching of 1 Thessalonians; (2) a comparison with 1 Thessalonians as to literary style, and as to the general characteristics of the community implied by the Epistles.

The argument derived from the Apocalyptic section in 2 Thessalonians has taken, in the main, two forms.

(a) It has been said, in the first place, that it is, whatever it means, irreconcilable with 1 Thessalonians. In the first Epistle St. Paul describes the Parousia as imminent; in the second he protests against those who maintain that the day of the Lord "*ἔνεστηκε*," and says that it will not come before the revelation of the "Man of Lawlessness." Moreover, in 1 Thessalonians St. Paul, though speaking of the Parousia as imminent, says that it will come as a thief in the night,—i.e. suddenly and unexpectedly—whereas in 2 Thessalonians he says that he had told the Thessalonians of the Apostasy, and the revelation of the Man of Lawlessness which would be the signs of the Parousia.

These arguments do not seem to bear investigation. It is true that in 1 Thessalonians St. Paul implies that the day of the Parousia is imminent, but 2 Thessalonians does not contradict this; *ἔνεστηκε* does not mean "is imminent," but "has come," and St. Paul never meant that the day of the Lord was not future, to however close a future he might assign it.

(b) In the second place, some critics have maintained that this passage contains the so-called Nero Saga, which is of course later than St. Paul. The main points of this legend are well known: when the Emperor died in A.D. 68, the first feeling of the populace was joy at their deliverance from the tyrant, but in a short time doubts began to arise as to whether the report of his death was not a piece of news too good to be true. The result was that pretenders appeared who gave themselves out as Nero. The first of these appeared in 69, and was speedily destroyed. Another

From *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, London, 1930, pp. 77-86. Used by permission of the publishers, Rivington & Co.

eleven years later, in the reign of Titus, was, according to Zonaras, recognized as Nero by Artabanus, the King of the Parthians; and still later in 88 another impostor almost succeeded in raising the Parthians in revolt against Domitian. After 88 the fact of Nero's death was recognized; but a belief arose that he would rise from the dead and lead the armies of the East against Rome. Finally, the figure of Nero himself became obscure, and there remained that of a partly human, partly diabolic Antichrist.

It used frequently to be thought that the Nero Saga was in this way the source of the whole Antichrist legend, and it was argued that in this case 2 Thessalonians, which shows clear traces of the Antichrist legend, cannot be earlier than the death of Nero, and therefore cannot have been written by St. Paul. This argument, or something like it, certainly played a great part in the commentaries on 2 Thessalonians in the nineteenth century. But it is unnecessary to discuss it in detail, because W. Bousset to his many services to the study of the New Testament has added this, that he has shown the true history of the Antichrist legend to be independent of the Nero Saga, and far older than the time of St. Paul.

The history of the Antichrist legend is far too complicated to be dealt with here: the main outlines alone can be given. There seems to have been current among the Jews, and among other Eastern peoples, the belief that the "end shall be as the beginning." The sign that the New Age is near at hand will be the repetition of the events preceding the creation. Now, these events comprised a struggle between God and a daemonic being who strove to take the place of God. This is the old Babylonian myth of the strife between Marduk and Tiamat, of which there are many traces in the Old Testament. It was believed that at the end of this age the struggle would again be renewed, and the victory of God would be the inauguration of a New Age, as it had formerly been of the Creation. Thus we find in Jewish and in Early Christian sources a certain amount of confusion of thought as to whether the Antichrist would be a human or a daemonic figure, and sometimes even a duplication in which a human Antichrist is accompanied or followed by a still more terrible supernatural apparition.

So much is now generally accepted: it still leaves almost as difficult as ever the problems connected with the exact exegesis of St. Paul's words. We are still incapable of giving a decisive answer to the questions whether St. Paul expected a Jewish or a Gentile "Man of Lawlessness," and whether "he that letteth" (ὁ κατέχων) was a supernatural being or the Roman Empire. But these problems may be left on one side for the present purpose. What is important is that the result of the last fifteen years of research is decisively to remove the eschatological argument from the list of possible objections to the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians.

It is, therefore, not surprising that there was in the last years of the nineteenth century a strong reaction in favour of 2 Thessalonians. In 1903, however, this reaction was checked and reversed by the extremely able monograph of the late Prof. Wrede, *Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs*. In this it was freely admitted that the apocalyptic section could not be used as the basis of any discussion either of the date or of the

authenticity of the Epistle, but the attention of scholars was recalled to the literary problem afforded by the comparison of 1 and 2 Thessalonians. This may shortly be described as a remarkable combination of similarity and difference: the language is largely the same—so much so that it would, if found in two writers, completely justify the theory of literary dependence—but the general tone is quite different—so that no one would, apart from the tradition, ever have suggested that both letters were written by the same author to the same community. The extent of this similarity, which is at once felt on reading the Epistles rapidly through one after the other, may be seen best in the tables given by Wrede. The dissimilarity can also be felt on a cursory reading of both Epistles, though it is more difficult to analyze, but the main points are: (1) 1 Thessalonians is full of the deepest and most heartfelt sympathy and friendship, but 2 Thessalonians is much cooler, and, as it were, official in tone; (2) 1 Thessalonians seems to imply a purely Gentile community, while 2 Thessalonians shows no trace of Gentile thought, and contains no reference to anything implying Gentile origin, but, on the contrary, shows a strongly Jewish colouring, with—in spite of the absence of definite quotations—perhaps a more strongly marked resemblance to the thought and language of the Old Testament than any book in the New Testament except the Apocalypse. There are other points in which a contrast can be observed, but these are the most noticeable, and are the main reasons for the difficulty, so ably expressed by Wrede, of believing that the two Epistles could have been written by the same writer, to the same community, at the same time. If both had been written by the same writer, and the identity of language were explained merely as due to the fact that the same ideas were in his mind when he wrote both letters, it would be almost impossible to doubt that they were written at the same or almost the same time. But the community cannot have changed from Gentile to Jewish, and it is very improbable that St. Paul's tone can have so suddenly altered; if therefore, so Wrede argued, we accept the tradition connecting the Second Epistle with Thessalonica, we are bound to doubt the Pauline authorship. It is then important to notice that the one passage which presents no parallelism to the First Epistle is the apocalyptic section. Wrede, therefore, suggested that we ought to regard the Second Epistle as the work of some unknown writer, who found that the Thessalonians were too much imbued with an immediate expectation of the Parousia, and therefore wrote a warning that the Parousia could not come before the Antichrist, of whom, it is implied, no sign has yet been seen, while in order to secure attention for his warning he surrounded it in a mosaic of Pauline phraseology from 1 Thessalonians, and issued it as an Epistle of St. Paul.

This theory of Wrede, set out, as it was, in his own clear and most attractive style, immediately met with a friendly reception, and swung the pendulum back again against the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians. Nor was it for a long time satisfactorily answered: even von Dobschütz, in the 7th edition of Meyer's commentary (1909), did not really make any decisive reply, though he emphasized with truth the strange fact that it is

only because we possess 1 Thessalonians that any one doubts the authenticity of the Second Epistle, for there is nothing un-Pauline in it, and the only reason for disputing its authorship is the difficulty of finding room for it alongside of 1 Thessalonians. This may be described as a plea which is perhaps sufficient for a stay of execution, but scarcely adequate for a reversal of judgment.

Recently, however, Prof. Harnack has read a paper to the Berlin Academy which throws a new light on the question. He does not dispute Wrede's contention that 2 Thessalonians cannot have been written at the same time, by the same writer, to the same community as 1 Thessalonians, but, instead of solving the problem by denying the identity of the writer, he does it by a closer consideration of the circumstances of the Church at Thessalonica, and by the suggestion that alongside of the Gentile community implied by the First Epistle there was a smaller and earlier Jewish community to which the Second Epistle was directed.

It is, of course, plain that this suggestion takes the force out of most of the objections to the authenticity of the Epistle, and Harnack's reconstruction of the circumstances which led up to its being sent is extremely attractive. St. Paul ends the First Epistle by adjuring its recipients to see that it was read by all the Christians; and in the immediately preceding verse there seems to be a similar emphasis on the idea of *all* the brethren. It would therefore seem that he was aware of a division at Thessalonica which justified the fear that his letter would not be read to all the community unless he insisted on it. In view of the obviously Gentile character of those whom he is addressing in 1 Thessalonians, the only probable view as to the authority whom he wished to reach is that they were Jewish Christians. But, suggests Harnack, there is nothing in 1 Thessalonians which would be especially agreeable to Jewish Christians, and several points which might be obnoxious to them. Therefore, immediately after the First Epistle the Second was despatched for the benefit of the Jewish Christians. In support of this theory one other piece of corroborative evidence can be alleged, though the point is complicated a little by the uncertainty of the text. In 2 Thess. ii. 13 St. Paul says that he is bound to thank God *ὅτι εἰλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπαρχὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν*, if we follow the text of B F G P 17 al f vg syr^h Did. Dam. Amb., etc., or *ὅτι . . . ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν* if we follow *κ* D E K L al pler. d e g syr^{mh} boh. arm. aeth. Chr., etc. Merely as a matter of textual criticism, there is about as much to be said for the one reading as the other—probably, if it were merely a question of evidence and lexical probability, most critics would choose *ἀπαρχὴν*, because it is the more Pauline expression, but in practice *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* has been followed because of the difficulty of giving an adequate meaning to *ἀπαρχὴν*—"God chose you as a first-fruit,"—for in what sense could the Thessalonians be regarded as first-fruits? The expression seemed not to be true to history in any sense, for they were neither St. Paul's earliest converts, nor were they the first in Macedonia. Therefore interpreters have preferred to think that the passage is a reference to predestination rather than to the facts of history, and to read *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. If, however, Harnack's suggestion be fol-

lowed, the matter appears in a new light, for the Jewish Christians in Thessalonica were, according to the Acts, the first-fruits of St. Paul's preaching in that city, though they were soon surpassed in numbers by the Gentile converts.

The obvious objection to which this theory is liable is that the address given in 2 Thess. i. 1 is "To the Church of the Thessalonians," just as it is in 1 Thess. i. 1, and Harnack suggests that we ought to regard this as probably not original. He points out that the address of Ephesians, (and, it might be added, of Romans) shows signs of having been tampered with, and that that of the Epistle to the Hebrews has been wholly lost. He thinks that the original address may have been *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Θεσσαλονικέων τῶν ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς*, and that the last four words dropped out early in the tradition of the Epistle. An alternative suggestion might be that the bearers of the Epistle were given special instructions, or that the name of the individual to whom it was sent secured that it would reach the Jewish Christians; it may have been inexpedient in the letter itself to emphasize the difference between the two classes of Christians.

As Harnack himself admits, his theory is open to some objections, but on the whole it seems to be far more acceptable than any other which has yet been put forward, and whereas before its publication the balance of argument seemed to be in favour of some such hypothesis as that of Wrede, and against the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians, the situation is now reversed, and there is sufficient justification for accepting the Epistle as a genuine document belonging, together with 1 Thessalonians, even if not so certainly, to the earliest period of Christian life in Thessalonica. In any case, however, the point which it is most desirable to emphasize is that the main argument against the Epistle is the difficulty of imagining circumstances to account for its curious combination of likeness to and difference from the First Epistle—and such an argument is too negative to be ever quite decisive; while, on the other hand, the main argument in favour of it is traditional ascription, which, however highly it be valued, is insufficient to give absolute confidence, if it be impossible to present a probable reconstruction of the circumstances under which the letter was written. Harnack has succeeded in producing a reconstruction which is, at the least, not impossible, and therefore we are justified in using 2 Thessalonians in reconstructing Timothy's report, even though it must be conceded that points derived exclusively from it have not the same certainty as those derived from the First Epistle.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Albert Schweitzer

WHAT ARE THE writings which can be accepted as authoritative sources for Paul's teaching?

As regards the speeches of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles, it is possible that they are based upon traditions of speeches which he actually delivered, but in the form in which we have them they doubtless belong to the author of Acts, and are adapted to his representation of the facts. As authentic testimony to the teaching of Paul they are consequently not to be trusted.

As certain sources we have, in the first place, the four main Epistles, that to the Galatians, the two to the Corinthians, and that to the Romans. The authenticity of these are accepted by F. C. Baur (1792-1860) and the Tübingen school which derived from him, though they declared the other writings attributed to St. Paul to be spurious and sought the author of these writings in the ranks of the Gentile Christian party which, after Paul's death, was involved in controversies, on the one hand with Jewish Christianity, and on the other with the beginnings of Gnosticism. The four great Epistles were called in question only by Bruno Bauer (1809-1882), and the Dutch radicals Allard Pierson and A. D. Loman, and those who as their successors in this line of criticism endeavoured to prove Paulinism to be a literary creation of the second century.

Since Baur's day the objections brought by the Tübingen school against the genuineness of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, the Epistle to the Philippians, and to Philemon have been shown to be untenable. These writings, in addition to the four main Epistles, may now be treated as unquestionably genuine.

On the other hand, the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, the two Epistles to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus are not genuine. Against the genuineness of 2 Thessalonians, in addition to the suspicions roused by the language, there is the difficulty that it explicitly opposes the idea that the Return of Jesus is immediately at hand, and enumerates all that must happen before that Day can dawn (2 Thess. ii. 1-12). It was only at a period subsequent to the death of Paul that Christian teachers found themselves obliged to find such means of reconciling believers to the delay of that event.

The Epistles, generally known as Pastoral, to Timothy and Titus, offer Pauline ideas only in quite general phraseology. The exhortations to fellow-workers of Paul's, now become leaders of the churches, which form their

From *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, pp. 41-51. Copyright 1931 by Henry Holt and Co., Inc., New York.

principal content, presuppose the struggle with Gnosticism; that is to say, we have here to do with writings dating from the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. It is in vain that repeated attempts have been made to prove their genuineness, or, at the least, to discover in them short notes written by Paul, which were later worked up in these forms in order to make them serviceable to the Church in its struggle with Gnosticism.

A special problem is presented by the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians. They differ in a peculiar way from those to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians. At the same time they have so much in common with these that the assumption of spuriousness offers almost as many difficulties as that of genuineness. The style of these two writings is more elaborate and, at the same time, clumsier than that of the others. The length of the periods and the coinages of compound words arrest attention. The thoughts of Paul are present here, but they no longer present the same clear outlines as do the other Epistles, and in part have begun to undergo a process of transformation. The struggle against circumcision seems to have reached an issue, as well as that with the Jewish zealots and the Apostles at Jerusalem who stood behind them. The Paul of the Epistle to the Ephesians speaks of the "Holy Apostles" as though he did not belong to the same generation and did not hold himself to be an Apostle (Eph. iii. 5).

Whatever solution may be given, however, to the complicated literary problem of the Colossian and Ephesian Epistles it is not of primary importance for the exposition of Paul's teaching. There is so much that is peculiar in their ideas that these cannot in any case be simply dovetailed with those from the certainly genuine Epistles, but must in some way be allowed to take a place alongside of them.

Similarly 2nd Thessalonians and the Pastorals, if an attempt is made to use them as genuine, neither enrich nor make clearer the picture of Paul's doctrine arising from the other Epistles.

Paul's Letters are "occasional" writings. He did not compose them with a view to giving a connected account of his teaching, but expounded his views only as fully as the circumstances which gave rise to the Letters appeared to demand. We have to try to recreate a connected picture of his teaching from fragments which owe their existence to a particular polemical or apologetic interest. The fact that this is to some extent possible shows that we are dealing with ideas which are derived from a fundamental conception and are closely connected with one another.

The first Letter to the Thessalonians is doubtless to be regarded as the earliest of these Letters. Paul takes up his pen in order to give the newly founded church, from which he had been driven away by a persecution set on foot by the Jews, news of his welfare, to strengthen them in their faith and in steadfastness under persecution.

The Letter to the Galatians was written by the Apostle to the church which he had founded on his second missionary journey in north-eastern

Phrygia, which he had visited again on his third journey, in order to defend his authority. Zealots from Jerusalem were on the point of convincing the Gentile converts that in order to be true Christians they must accept the Jewish Law and the rite of circumcision. They were endeavouring to persuade these people that Paul was keeping something back from them if he had not given them this teaching. And, moreover, they were denying that he was an Apostle at all in the same sense as those in Jerusalem.

The Letter in which Paul repels this attack upon his teaching and his authority dates probably from the time when, in his third missionary journey, he spent two and a quarter years in Ephesus (Acts xix. 8-10). Whether he succeeded in preventing the apostasy of this church or not we are not informed.

It was also during the sojourn at Ephesus that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written. The latter was occasioned by news of occurrences and circumstances in the Church at Corinth, in regard to which Paul had to state his attitude. At the same time he had to answer questions which had been submitted to him. And here too he was obliged to defend his apostolic authority, for his opponents were asserting that he was postponing his visit because he had not the courage to face and answer them. So far had things gone that Paul asks whether he is to come with a rod or in the spirit of meekness (1 Cor. iv. 21).

He holds out a prospect of an early visit. He intends after Pentecost to come by the land route through Macedonia and to remain with them for some time, perhaps throughout the winter (1 Cor. xvi. 5-9). He says he has already begun to collect funds, which he will later deliver, as a tribute from the Gentiles to the Church at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1-4). Meanwhile he sends Timothy in advance to deal with urgent matters.

A few months after this Letter a second became necessary. This is almost entirely devoted to the controversy with his opponents, who were becoming more and more arrogant. Against these agitators Paul was forced to take up the pen while still on his journey from Ephesus to Corinth. He won at least a partial victory. Titus, sent on by him to Corinth, was able on his return to Macedonia, to report to him that the opponent who had been bitterest against him had been condemned by the church by an impressive majority, though he had very soon after been received into favour again, a proceeding to which Paul had to give his retrospective approval (2 Cor. ii. 1-11, vii. 5-13). And Titus was able to tell them that zeal on his behalf and a longing for his presence were manifest in the Corinthian church (2 Cor. vii. 7). In the middle of the Letter he recurs again to the matter of the collection for the Jerusalem Christians.

Thus the first Letter to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus in the spring, the second Letter to the Corinthians from Macedonia in the autumn. In the following winter at Corinth the Epistle to the Romans was composed. These three main Epistles thus originated at short intervals in the course of a few months.

In the Epistle to the Romans Paul is preparing the way for a visit to the west. He finds that there is no longer any room for him in the region

between Jerusalem and Illyria (Rom. xv. 23). He has a mind to go even as far as Spain (Rom. xv. 24). What urges him to this decision is the conviction that he is called to preach the Gospel throughout the whole world. Another thing that suggests to him working in the west is that the enmity of the Jews, as well as that of the Jewish Christians behind whom stood the Apostles at Jerusalem, made any hope of successful missionary work in the east for the present impossible. He does not indeed explicitly say this to the Romans, but what is in his heart they could gather from the fact that he entreats them to pray to God that he might be delivered from the unbelievers in Jerusalem, and that the offering which he was taking with him for the saints at Jerusalem might be well-pleasing to them (Rom. xv. 20-31).

As he has to reckon with the possibility that the Church at Rome might have been prejudiced against him, or, when his travel plans became known, might have adverse influences brought to bear on it, he seeks to put himself right in advance by setting forth in this Letter his attitude towards the Law. In this Apologia he does not deny the ground principles of his teaching, but he walks as warily as it is possible to do. All polemic against the Apostles in Jerusalem is avoided, and his attachment to his ancestral race is emphasised to the utmost.

What kind of reception this Apologia met with we do not know. It was not as he purposed in the following autumn that he found his way to Rome, but only two and a half years later (in the spring), and then not in the course of a journey to Spain but as a prisoner. Christians from Rome who had heard of his arrival from the brethren at Puteoli went to meet him on the Appian Way as far as Appii Forum, forty-three Roman miles from Rome (Acts xxviii. 14-15).

During his imprisonment in Rome Paul wrote the Epistle to the Philippians. They had sent him a gift, and had probably also intended that Epaphroditus the bearer of it should remain with him as his attendant. This intention, however, was not realised, for Epaphroditus fell dangerously ill, and after his recovery desired to return home (Phil. ii. 25-30). He took with him Paul's Letter with the expression of his gratitude and his exhortations to the Philippians. The Apostle takes an optimistic view of his own situation. Though he has to take into account the possibility of a fatal outcome of his imprisonment (Phil. ii. 17), he nevertheless has great hopes of being soon set at liberty and of coming again to Philippi (Phil. i. 25-26, ii. 24).

Another Letter written during his imprisonment was that to a Christian named Philemon, who probably lived at Colossae. Paul had become acquainted with a runaway slave of his named Onesimus and had converted him. He had charged him to return to his master, and now gives him a note of a few lines, in which he begs Philemon to pardon him, and henceforth to count him no longer as a slave but a brother in Christ. In this Letter also Paul expresses the hope of soon being set at liberty and revisiting the churches of Asia Minor.

Objection has been taken to the slave's having run away to Rome, and

returning to his master from so far away, over land and sea, and it is suggested that the situation would be more intelligible if the Letter had been written during one of his Asian imprisonments—for we know Paul was frequently imprisoned (2 Cor. xi. 23)—or from his prison at Caesarea. And in the case of the Letter to the Philippians also it has been suggested that it dates from one of the earlier imprisonments rather than from the Roman. This is not impossible. But the fact that Paul sends greetings from “those of Caesar’s house,” that is to say, slaves from the Imperial household (Phil. iv. 22), makes it on the whole most probable that the writing originated in Rome. It is true that we know from inscriptions at Ephesus that there existed there, and no doubt elsewhere in the province, associations of freed slaves and Imperial slaves (*servi domini nostri Augusti*). But the most natural interpretation of the phrase “they of Caesar’s house” is that it really does refer to a church formed among the slaves of the Emperor’s household.

And in view of the constant coming and going which at that time took place over the Mediterranean area it is quite conceivable that the Church at Philippi should have sent a gift to Paul at Rome, and that he should have sent back to Asia Minor a runaway slave from those parts.

Do we possess these Letters in the actual form in which they were written? This question naturally suggests itself in view of the fact that they were copies, and collected not so much as letters, that is to say, historical documents, but as writings to be read at divine service. It is therefore conceivable that those who copied them may sometimes have been led by practical considerations to divide and arrange the material which lay before them in the manner most useful for this purpose. Another matter that must be taken into consideration is that the form of the writings might be influenced by the vicissitudes to which the papyrus on which they were recorded was exposed. They were written on papyrus strips which were attached to one another. If a strip at beginning or end became detached, the letter was without opening or close and might happen, when copied out again, to be attached to another Letter of Paul, and subsequently to become a permanent part of the MS. A similar fate might befall these detached beginnings and endings. And the possibility that several letters addressed to one church might subsequently be joined together into a single letter for public reading is also to be taken into account.

1st Thessalonians and Galatians make the impression of lying before us in the original. In the case of 1st and 2nd Corinthians there are grounds for thinking that both really contain several letters. In 1 Cor. v. 9 Paul mentions a letter which he had sent them earlier, to exhort them to separate themselves from the unchaste. In 2 Cor. ii. 4, ii. 9, and vii. 8-16, he refers to a letter written with tears, in which he had sought to prove them, whether they were still loyal to him. This letter must have been severe in tone, for Paul had learnt from Titus that the believers had been deeply grieved by it. The letter thus referred to in 2nd Corinthians cannot be contained in 1st Corinthians, for this document does not make the impres-

sion of being written with tears or of summoning the church to return once more to its allegiance to the Apostle.

Paul must then, it would seem, have written no less than four letters to the Corinthians. If so, are we to believe that only two have been preserved? It is more natural to assume that two of them no longer exist separately, but in the course of being copied for use in public worship were interpolated into the two others. That would explain at once the bulk and the lack of unity of the two Letters which have come down to us. How their contents are to be distributed among the four letters can no longer be determined with certainty. The tearful letter, or at least a piece of it, is no doubt to be found in the so-called Four Chapters Letter (2 Cor. x. 1-xiii. 14). The moving arguments in which Paul shows why he, in spite of all the scorn of his opponents, has the right to hold himself to be a real Apostle and as such to demand their obedience, does really make the impression of being written with tears. And the searing irony with which they are written is sufficiently wounding to grieve the Corinthian readers. The hypothesis that these four chapters, although they now come after 2 Corinthians i.-ix., came in point of time before them was first put forward by Adolf Hausrath in the year 1870.

The identification of the earlier letter mentioned in 1 Corinthians v. 9 is rendered difficult by the fact that we know too little about its character and contents. The only thing we are told about it is that it commanded the readers to separate themselves from the unchaste. A fragment of this letter is doubtless to be found in 2 Corinthians vi. 14-vii. 1, where an exhortation of this kind appears in an argument by Paul about his attitude to the Corinthians. It is also possible that the warnings against partaking in idolatrous feasts, and the references to the Israelites who perished in the wilderness on account of unchastity and idolatry in 1 Corinthians x. 1-33, may have come from this letter, since in their present place they do not connect either with what precedes or what follows them.

Speaking generally, indeed, how many passages in the Corinthian Letters lie side by side without obvious connection! The arguments about the rights of an Apostle in 1 Corinthians ix. come in quite unexpectedly and break off equally abruptly. Chapters ix., x., and xi. of 1st Corinthians are three separate blocks, not even connected with one another, which break into a series of explanations of which each begins with "As concerning" (. . . 1 Corinthians vii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 1, xii. 1), which according to 1 Corinthians vii. 1 are answers to questions which had been communicated to the Apostle in a letter from Corinth. In the second Letter the two tame chapters, in which directions are given for the collection from Jerusalem (2 Cor. viii.-ix.), stand in marked contrast with their surroundings.

This kind of disconnectedness and dislocation is most simply explained, if we assume that in 1st and 2nd Corinthians we have really the substance of four letters.

Philippians, again, may possibly consist of two distinct letters. It has always been noticed that, with the beginning of the third chapter, the tone suddenly changes. The excited lines against the "dogs" (Phil. iii. 2) and the

"enemies of the cross of Christ" (Phil. iii. 18), aimed at the Jewish Christian zealots, come as a bolt from the blue. It is therefore worthy of consideration whether the section Phil. iii. 2-iv. 9 may not be a fragment of a letter from the time when Paul in Macedonia had to defend himself against Jewish Christian opponents. For even in these churches conflicts must have taken place. When Paul at the end of his third missionary journey, instead of taking ship from Ephesus to Corinth, chose the land route via Macedonia, that was doubtless because his presence here was necessary. At that part of his journey he found, as he tells the Corinthians, no rest for his flesh; nothing but afflictions, fighting without and fears within (2 Cor. vii. 5).

In Romans the long list of greetings which are to be given to beloved friends (Rom. xvi. 1-23) certainly cannot belong to the original of this letter. How could Paul have so many personal relations with a church with which, on his own showing, he is not yet acquainted? It is therefore probable that Romans xvi. 1-23 originally formed part of a letter addressed to a church which he knew well in Asia Minor, and in a later copying became attached to the Epistle to the Romans. Since Aquila and Priscilla are mentioned among those to whom greetings are to be given, Ephesus seems to be the most probable destination of the letter. This view regarding the list of greetings in the Epistle to the Romans was first expressed by David Schulz in the year 1829.

But if the Epistle to the Romans contained the list of greetings belonging to another letter, it is possible that it has also preserved some other portions of the latter's content. Is it not a little remarkable, that Paul writing to an unknown church should give directions as to what attitude should be taken up towards those who rejected the use of flesh and wine and other things, and approved nothing but vegetarian food for believers (Rom. xiv. 1-xv. 13)? These explanations about the strong and the weak would be much more intelligible if, having received news of a church well known to him, he is giving directions for the settlement of a controversy. If so, the case is that the Epistle to the Romans, at a time when it was being copied for reading in public worship, has taken up into itself a letter of which the Roman church at that time possessed a copy, but which had not been originally addressed to this church.

We have therefore to reckon with the possibility that the copy of a collection of the Pauline Epistles, on which our knowledge of the Apostle's letters rests, did not contain the Epistles to the Corinthians, Philippians and Romans in the original form, but in the version which they had assumed in the copies prepared for the purpose of reading at public worship.

But that means no more than that the order of the several sections is not always the original connection. It does not mean that there had been a real working over of the text. Here and there no doubt the marginal gloss of a copyist may have become interpolated into the text; but all efforts to prove any systematic interpolation have proved impossible to carry out. In the second half of the nineteenth century Christian Hermann Weisse and Daniel Völter and others thought it necessary to seek for an original

text of the Pauline Letters behind that which has come down to us. The net results of their efforts was to show how arbitrary these proposed excisions were.

Have all the Epistles which Paul wrote come down to us? A possibility that some of them may have been lost must be admitted. We have constantly to remind ourselves that the reason why the Epistles were preserved was simply that they were treated as edifying writings for use in public worship, and as such were copied and circulated among the various churches. It is thus possible that many shorter letters of the Apostle's, or even those of some length, through the accident of not being transmitted from the churches to which they were addressed, and thus being included in the collection of Pauline letters which was continually recopied, fell into oblivion and so perished.

The wonder is, indeed, that so many were preserved. Writings like the Letter to the Galatians and the second to the Corinthians do not really seem destined to live. How came the churches to preserve documents which redounded so little to their credit? And it is still more astonishing that they allowed their shame to be continually recalled in public worship. How strong must have been the magic of the name of Paul, whose writings dealing with obsolete and therefore unintelligible questions and controversies, writings which contained such severe strictures on the contemporary churches, instead of being handed over to oblivion received the status and respect of edifying treatises! The fact that writings, the content of which was so unfavourable to their survival, have nevertheless come down to us makes it probable that circumstances were favourable to the preservation of the Pauline Epistles. What has been lost was lost through accident or carelessness, and doubtless at a very early date.

In any case, what has survived, be it much or little in proportion to the total amount of Paul's actual writings, is sufficient to give us some conception of his vigorous intelligence. We can never be thankful enough to those unknown church leaders and copyists through whose action these treasures have been preserved to us.

.

Part IV
INSIGHTS INTO PAULINE THEOLOGY

[WHERE PAUL'S THEOLOGY BEGINS]

Adolf Deissmann

THE NEW CREATION in communion with Christ . . . is a new chord in the Pauline oratorio. Paul did not work out a complicated dogmatic system shewing how the grace of God in Christ had brought about and continued to bring salvation to men, but in a fulness of similes, he expressed the one great experience of salvation.

The impression of complexity has only arisen because we have not understood the similes as similes which were synonymous with one another, though to the mind of antiquity they would easily have been so understood. The single so-called Pauline ideas have been isolated by us, and then the attempt has been made to reconstruct a chronological order of salvation, an "*ordo salutis*," as our ancestors called it. As a matter of fact, the religion of Paul is something quite simple. It is communion with Christ. In Christ, the unfathomable mysteries of God's mercy become clear to him: that is his experience of salvation. In Christ, he comes to an entirely different judgment of himself, and that is the New Creation.

Paul answered two questions for himself. What has God done? and, What have I experienced? . . .

"*New Creation*." Paul was specially gifted in the coining of clear-cut phrases. It is a great misunderstanding of Paul to suppose that the long periods, which occur, for instance, in the Epistle to the Romans, are characteristic of his style. I believe when Paul composed these long periods it was because the development of his thought was halting. In his great creative moments he succeeded in expressing himself in monumental lines of extraordinary conciseness and power. Once in a Berlin Greek Society, I read Heraclitus with some friends of mine and was reminded by his style, on several points, of Paul. It would not be difficult from the Pauline epistles to gather together a collection of such monumental sayings; for example, "The letter killeth, but the spirit gives life;" "The Jews ask for signs, the Greeks seek after wisdom;" "The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power;" "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth;" "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." If it had happened that Paul had only been known to us through a collection of a few such fragments, then, simply on account of such phrases, we should have to reckon him among the greatest minds of antiquity.

To this class of great, important sayings, full of meaning, belongs the passage, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation;" or: "therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature."

From *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, New York, 1923, pp. 222-41.
Reprinted by permission of Harper & Brothers.

I think there lies in this confession a clear reflection of Paul's conversion experience. . . . We may read here the second page of the Pauline Genesis, on the first page of which was written the sudden blaze of light near Damascus.

Living in Christ, Paul divides his life into two great periods, that of the old Paul, and that of the Paul newly created. The "old man" had lived in other spheres.

Let us now consider the single experiences of the new man Paul.

The flesh has no power over the new man, because as a follower of Christ he has "crucified" the flesh.

We shall have more to say of this peculiar Pauline thought presently.

As a new creature Paul the Christian is also free from sin. He has been loosed from sin—but, is he also sinless, incapable of sinning? In theory certainly Paul might subscribe to the statement that the Christian does not sin. But the awful experiences of practice would give him cause to doubt. Paul the shepherd of souls retained a sober judgment; freedom from sin is not conceived of as something mechanical and magical. Side by side with all his moral exhortations to Christians to battle against sin there are confessions of Paul the Christian himself, especially in his letter to the Romans, witnessing that even the new-created feels at times the old deep sense of sin. But in Christ the grace of God is daily vouchsafed to him anew, and daily he experiences anew the renovating creative power of that grace.

The new Paul is also rid of that fellowship with Adam which is a fellowship of death. He is no longer "in Adam," but "in Christ," and in Christ he has the guarantee that death has been overcome.

Paul the Christian is also a new creature because in Christ he is free from the Law: "Christ is the end of the Law."

The "letter" is overcome by the "spirit." The problem of the Law was especially torturing to the former Pharisee, and it occupies a large amount of space in the letters owing to Paul's polemical position with regard to the Judaisers. But it was not solved by one single statement in round terms. It is a true paradox that Paul the antinomist remained a pious Bible Christian and could still upon occasion quote the words of the Law as an authority. His polemic against the Law, though often harsh, seeks to preserve for the Law at least a portion of its dignity. Freedom from the slavery of the Law is conceived in no sense favourable to libertinism.

Like Jesus, Paul proclaims that the quintessence of the Law is contained in the commandment to love one's neighbour.

This freedom from the Law stands in Paul's Epistles strongly in the foreground. It has an outer basis, and an inner one. It was necessary for Paul to speak a great deal about the Law, in view of the anti-Judaic polemic that was forced upon him. . . . But for him personally, too, the Law had been an inner matter of extraordinary importance from his earliest childhood. Even in his old age there stood out clearly to his soul one experience

of his childhood, concerning which he gives pathetic hints in his letter to the Romans. We might speak of it as his fall:—

For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.

Paul is probably thinking here in the first place of his earliest childhood, which he elsewhere describes as the time of childish immaturity; the idea of "sin" and the sense of guilt were both still unknown to him. But then came a sad day that he could never forget. In the Synagogue the child had seen from afar with awe and curiosity the solemn rolls of the Law in their brilliant embroidered coverings, but now for the first time the "thou shalt" of the Law, conveyed to him, no doubt, by the mouth of a parent, entered commandingly into his consciousness. The Law's "thou shalt" was, however, closely followed by the child's "I will not" and transgression. Paul does not say what the occasion was. But he indicates that this first sin wrought terrible havoc in his sensitive young soul: he felt himself deceived; it was as if he had tasted death:—"I died."

We do not know when this tragedy took place in the soul of the youthful Paul; many of us know from personal experience what agony the sense of guilt can cause even in childish years. Jewish teachers, at least of a later period, seem to have assumed that a child grew to the age of nine without knowing anything of sin; but that then, with the awakening of the "evil instinct," sin began. More important, however, than the explanation of this experience in detail is the fact which, I think, can be certainly concluded from it. The man who experienced this fall cannot have had a sunny, happy youth; the Law, sin, and death had already cast their gloomy shadows upon the soul of the gifted boy, and the prevailing tone of his mind as he gradually matured into the conscious Jew may be described, according to his own indication, as one of slavish anxiety—that is, not merely the fear of God in the old Biblical sense, but the deep distress of one "born under the Law" concerning his soul's salvation:—

"O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of this body of death?"

Even in his Christian period Paul is capable of such cries for help when the old distress wakes in him again.

I do not regard it as right to separate these appalling phrases from Paul himself, as if he were not speaking of his own inner life, but were only explaining in a quiet way some theological example of dogmatic facts of general application. Rather these sentences are real confessions, and justify us in suggesting that Paul, living "in Law," had very nearly approached the acting type of mystic, while the Paul living "in Christ" was an example of the reacting mystic.

How high the new Paul felt himself to be elevated above the "world" and its Satanic and daemonic powers, is shown by many powerful sayings

whose force depends on the sense they convey of personal union with Christ. The mightiest song of triumph is surely that in his letter to the Romans (8:35-39).

He who does not understand the bearing of this "in Christ" in Paul's religion, should let this psalm (which is really a piece of the Pauline oratorio) sink into his mind.

If we turn now to Paul's expression of "the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ," we thereby touch upon a singularity of Pauline religion that is as important and as peculiar as it is comparatively little noticed. In every religion we find some sort of an attitude taken up to the problem of suffering, and several great answers to this problem run through a number of religions, and are found also in Christianity. Suffering is traced back to a power opposed to God. We find this solution, which has come about through an act of intellectual resignation, even in Christianity. Or suffering is regarded as punishment sent by God for the sin of men; or suffering is in the hand of God the means of trying and purifying men. All these attitudes towards suffering are also found in Paul. But it is particularly noteworthy that he also discovered an entirely new attitude to suffering.

In all the before-mentioned answers to the problem of suffering, suffering is regarded as something abnormal, and the answers have this in common, that they come to terms with the fact which cannot be denied. They have the character of a compromise. The peculiarity of the Pauline attitude is this, that he has dared the paradox of regarding suffering in communion with Christ as something quite normal and necessary.

Paul has the conviction that "in Christ" he is in an especial way elevated above suffering. In this connection he gave form to one of the deepest, most pregnant conceptions that we owe to him: for since he suffers in Christ, his sufferings are to him "sufferings of Christ" or "afflictions of Christ."

It is exceedingly important that we rightly understand these Pauline technical expressions "the sufferings of Christ" and "the afflictions of Christ." . . . In one passage of Paul's letters, dogmatic exegesis has made a very great mistake: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the Church." This has been explained thus: Paul took it that the historical Christ had to bear a certain definite amount of suffering according to the will of God, but that He had not borne all this suffering in His historical Passion. A remainder was still left to be borne. It was therefore the task of Paul to bear this remainder which Christ had not borne.

That is a quite mistaken explanation. The true sense is rather this: I, Paul, have, as a member of the body of Christ, a certain amount of suffering to bear according to the will of God. Already I have borne much of this, and a remainder of my "afflictions of Christ" is still left for me to bear. So the term "afflictions of Christ" means the same as the term "my sufferings." The peculiarity and delicateness of this thought is that the sufferings

of Paul are "sufferings of Christ." This conviction can be made even clearer if we alter the Pauline saying: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" into "I suffer, yet not I, but Christ suffers in me."

This whole complex of thought about the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ is to be understood from the standpoint of the Pauline Christology. At the commanding centre of Paul's contemplation of Christ there stands the Living One who is also the Crucified, or the Crucified who is also alive. The death on the cross and the resurrection of Christ cannot in Paul be isolated as two distinct facts; as contemplated by him they are inseparably connected. This is shown even linguistically; the Greek perfect participle for "crucified" might be rendered "He who is the Crucified."

This language of the cult is found already in the Gospel. This Greek perfect participle goes a great way farther than the aorist, which would be equivalent to "He who was crucified," and which Paul never applied to Christ in his letters. The perfect tense, no doubt, indicates that the cross is not a bare fact in the historic past, but something whose influence is continued into the present; "the Crucified" is a reality which can be experienced every day, and the Johannine picture of the Living One who bears the wounds of the Crucified is as much Pauline as the double meaning of the Johannine word "lift up," which indicates at one and the same time the death on the lofty cross and the "exaltation" to spiritual glory in the sense of the passage in Philippians.

I would make another observation akin to this. Paul's use of the phrase "the blood of Christ," as a term characteristic of the cult, corresponds to his conviction of the identity of the Living One with the Crucified. The term "blood of Christ," in many passages at least, does not refer to the physical blood once shed at the historic martyrdom; it is a vivid way of realising the Living One who is also the Crucified, and with whom we live in mystic spiritual "fellowship of Blood."

Here, too, the Apostle expresses the conviction that he stands in a fellowship of suffering, a fellowship of the cross, and a fellowship of life with the spiritual Christ. In many passages the formula "in the blood of Christ" borders upon the formula "in Christ" and might be translated appropriately to the sense, "in the fellowship of blood with Christ."

Reviewing all this we see that the suffering Paul is not the old Paul but the new Paul, who is a member of the Body of Christ, and who therefore shares mystically in all that that Body experienced and now experiences: he "suffers with Christ," is "crucified with Christ," "dies," is "buried," is "raised," and "lives" with Christ. Thus suffering is not an anomaly in Paul's life, but, being the suffering of Christ, it is a normal part of his state as a Christian, and a certain fixed measure of "afflictions of Christ" must, as we saw, according to God's plan be "filled up" by him.

In this Pauline mysticism of suffering it is easy to recognise what I have called the undogmatic element in Paul. Dogmatic exegesis is puzzled by such passages; it tortures itself to find a meaning in them, and yet cannot express the inwardness of the mystic contemplation of suffering in theological formulae. But under the cross of Jesus a suffering man will

be able even to-day to experience for himself the depth of meaning and the comfort implied by Paul's "sufferings of Christ." Similarly the ancient Christians were easily able to comprehend the mystic application of the several stages of baptism to death, burial, and resurrection with Christ, because, having been baptised as adults, they had an indelibly vivid recollection of the ceremony as performed on them by immersion.

CONCURRENT PHASES OF PAUL'S RELIGION

Henry J. Cadbury

THE RELIGIOUS expression of Paul has long presented to interpreters grave difficulty. No verse of the New Testament is truer than one in II Peter which declares that in our beloved brother's epistles are some things hard to be understood. Although he is the best known of the early Christians—ever so much more fully transmitted to us than Jesus, his master—he remains nevertheless a confessed enigma, and no phase of him is more puzzling than his religion.

The reasons for this obscurity may be several. No doubt our modern preconceptions are partly to blame. We come to Paul's letters with a different outlook from his own and cannot follow his mind in its working or look with his eyes. He is concrete where we should be abstract, or he uses figures which we understand too literally. He writes out of and into a different *Weltanschauung* from our own. A wealth of thought lies behind his abbreviated expression; it is due to long and varied experience as a preacher, and motifs capable of clear and elaborate treatment in the letters are given but passing mention or are quickly combined. Perhaps it is the variety of his approach that causes our modern difficulty. He has been well called a "prismatic" personality. He has a many-track mind. An analysis of some of the different phases of his religion provides the best hope of a basis for the better understanding of it.

1

What then are some of the ways of analysis to which the Apostle's mind lends itself? The category of Paul's thinking which we may consider first is the apocalyptic. It is the expectation of a series of events in the future, connected with the end of the world. The importance of this element in the New Testament is a modern rediscovery. Such eschatology is a Jewish belief, and it colors all the New Testament. It is unmistakably present in Paul. It is a philosophy of future history which he held not with absolute definiteness of detail but with undoubted confidence of expectation. The events were real events, not pictorial symbols. They included the coming of the Messiah, the resurrection of the dead and the "rapture" of the living Christians, and the day of judgment of all men at which Christ and the "saints" will officiate. These events marked the transition from this age to the next, and Paul believed that this crisis was near. The night is far spent, the day is at hand. The extensive account in

1 Corinthians on the resurrection and that in 2 Thessalonians on the Anti-christ give a partial picture of Paul's expectation. They agree with what we know from other sources of the general Pharisaic anticipation, and we may safely suppose that the whole current program was held by the Apostle and not merely the parts of it which he has occasion to express in the surviving letters.

.

2

A second category of Paul's religious thinking may be called the category of dispensation. He looks upon history as the succession of God's plans for mankind. First God has one scheme of dealing and then another. The coming of Jesus represents a change of schemes, the introduction of a new plan. Paul does not say that God has just invented it. He has always intended it. It has been kept secret a long time and only just revealed. When the fullness of time came, God made it known to the wonder and surprise of both men and angels.

This category of thinking is like the apocalyptic outlook in that each is a philosophy of history. Both divide history into two main sections. Probably both are Jewish in origin, for the category of time is a peculiarly Jewish way of thinking. Perhaps they are not entirely separate, though in Paul they seem largely separate. One of them deals with history as future events, the other rather as past schemes of God governing mankind. In the latter the transition has just been made; in the former it is imminent. From the viewpoint of God's past dispensations, mankind has recently been offered a new way of getting along. Announcement of this new provision rather than the promise of something in the future is the good news that Paul has now to report.

.

3

The third category of Paul's thinking about Christianity may be called the category of status. God's new plan for mankind brings a new status for the individual. Paul continues here his habit of contrast and describes the status of the Christian in a great variety of terms. The terms are taken from human social institutions, as terms for religion have to be. But here again the very variety of terms warns us against making too much of any one of them. Several of them are taken from the field of law and jurisprudence. Clearly one of them is taken from the procedure of the criminal law court. Justification means simply acquittal, and the new status of the Christian is like that of one whom the judge acquits of whatever crime he may or may not have committed. Redemption is another term familiar to us in theology but is really a secular legal term for the emancipation of a slave. The new status of the Christian is like that of a slave who is set free by a ransom that is paid for him. Adoption is also a legal term and describes a custom familiar in the Roman Empire. The new status of the Christian is that of a slave or orphan who is officially adopted as son and

heir by a wealthy and kindly father, or even that of an only child who graduates from the situation of a minor controlled by nurses and guardians into the freedom of the millionaire's boy upon reaching his majority.

In all these terms Paul seems to be making religion into a business or legal transaction, and there is no wonder that he has been misconstrued by the older generation and disliked by the younger generation as cramping religion into mechanical or formal terms. He is accused of making God an exacting creditor or an angry judge. But how utterly opposed is this criticism to Paul's own intention! Every one of these businesslike terms is used by Paul to show that it is not a businesslike transaction. Every metaphor is intended to deny the very thought it suggests. The debt is not collected but forgiven; the accused is not condemned but set free. God waives all his just claims. The new and favorable status of the Christian is one that he in no sense secures by his own merits. He is by nature guilty, but God acquits him; a slave, but God frees him; an orphan, but God adopts him; an outcast, but God reinstates him; an enemy, but God treats him as a friend. The metaphor aims to show how little man deserves, and, in contrast, how generous and forgiving God is. Grace is Paul's word for this attitude of God. Christ as the embodiment of God's benign purpose naturally appears in all these metaphors. It would be a long and difficult task to examine how Christ and especially his death are associated in Paul's mind with each of these figures. Paul evidently believes that such connection exists, but he rarely tells in detail just what it is and how it works. His phrases are familiar: Christ is the means of propitiation for our sins; Christ is the ransom price paid for our emancipation; Christ is the Passover lamb sacrificed for our purification; through Christ we become heirs of God; Christ became a curse for us to free us from a curse and sin for us that we might be acquitted of our sins. God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself; Christ made peace through the blood of his cross.

It is right for us to call these ideas metaphors and to avoid the danger of carrying metaphors too far. They are illustrations, a whole series of illustrations of the same fact. It is a wrong and most regrettable habit to distinguish them as different stages: justification, followed by sanctification, followed by redemption. They are concurrent—synonyms for the same fact. But we must not think, because they are metaphors or because there are so many of them, that the idea for which they stand is metaphorical too. The underlying fact for Paul was perfectly real and sure. The metaphors are not fiction; at least, it is not merely fictitious or imagined change of status to which they refer. Call it what you will, for Paul the Christian status is to be explained as a new creation. The believer is a new man; he leads a new life. He is now a free man, a son of God. . . .

4

The fourth phase of Paul's thought I must describe briefly, though it is extremely important for understanding him and also perhaps is the most foreign to our ways of thinking. Fortunately a clear-cut statement of it is

now available in English in Professor Carré's book, *Paul's Doctrine of Redemption*. I may call it the idea of cosmic conflict. Like his contemporaries, Paul believed that the world was in the control of invisible, supernatural, personal powers. These were of two kinds, good and evil, God and his angels, Satan and his devils. They were in constant conflict, and the fate of the world, of mankind, and of the individual rests upon the progress of the battle between them. Heretofore, thought Paul, the powers of evil had prevailed. God had been beaten by Satan when Adam and Eve sinned, and since that time Sin and Death have reigned in the world. By sin and death in this passage Paul does not mean sin and death as facts of human experience as we mean them. He uses these words sometimes in that way, but he also uses them as the names of two principal hostile spirits in the great battle between God and Satan. They are as much persons as God and Satan are and should be spelled with capitals. They reign over all mankind. All men are held prisoners by Sin. All men are enslaved by Death. The present evil age belongs to the powers of darkness, which are spoken of as "the rulers of this age." Among other names for God's enemies are the terms principality, power, throne, and dominion. They are apparently orders of Satan's angels, as Milton recognized in employing them.

The Christian hope and confidence means a change in this unhappy condition. In order for the world to be redeemed as a whole or for individuals to improve, God must get the mastery over Satan and his allies. Precisely this victory is what Paul awaits with assurance or announces as already accomplished. Mankind who have waited during God's period of defeat for their redemption may now be assured that the tide of battle has turned. God "delivered us out of the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love." Christ's coming, especially his resurrection, marks the decisive event in the great conflict. Death has plainly been defeated. The risen Christ has been "set far above every Principality and Power and Dominion and Authority." "If Christ has not risen our faith would be vain . . . but as it is, Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of them that are asleep. As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. For Christ must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is Death. Then cometh the end when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished every principality and every Authority and Power." That is the victory which Christ's death guarantees; meanwhile the Christian and indeed the whole creation groans in expectation waiting for deliverance from decay. But Paul is "persuaded that neither Death nor angels nor principalities nor powers shall be able to separate us from the love of God." "We are more than conquerors through him that loved us." Death's victory is canceled. Its sting of Sin is removed. God's law rules in us instead of Sin's law. "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord, Jesus Christ."

.

5

A fifth category of Paul's thinking is ethical. This aspect of religion is familiar to us and congenial to our modern prejudices. Many are inclined to count morality the whole of religion. It is plain moral character, sheer goodness. Ethics seems to us much less fictitious than the other categories. It is less remote from real experience; it is concrete and tangible in a sense that the apocalyptic hope, the twofold dispensations, the changing of status, or the cosmic conflict can never be to us. I need not insist that love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, and self-control were objective realities to Paul because they are realities to us also, as well as their opposites like fornication, uncleanness, strife, drunkenness, evil desire, and covetousness. But Paul's ethical standard is intimately associated with all his other categories. Like them, it is a clear-cut dualism. Right and wrong conduct are as explicit as the judgment day, they are as different as this age and the next. They are the works of God or the Devil. There is no relativity about vice and virtue for Paul. The Kingdom of God is said to consist of righteousness and peace and joy. God's new plan for mankind, man's new status before God, God's full triumph over Sin and the Devil, means simple goodness in men, not merely attributed goodness or vicarious goodness or goodness deferred to the next life, but real present character. Paul does not distinguish ethics from any other phase of religion. It so happens that in Greek the same root (*δικαιο*) means legal innocence and moral excellence, and Paul shifts from one meaning of the words to the other apparently without noticing it. Nor does he distinguish between the cosmic conflict and the personal conflict. He is not aware of the different senses of sin which we would distinguish by the use of a capital S or small letter s. Our victory over our sins is part and parcel of God's victory over that personal demonic slave-driver named Sin. Professor Weiss was quite right in saying that Paul felt himself saved by miracle and that he based even his ethical system upon supernaturalism.

For the same reason Paul links up his ideas of goodness with Christ. Somehow in all these categories Christ's death and resurrection seem to Paul to have an organic connection with the transition—whether it be from this age to the next, from the old dispensation to the new, from guilt to acquittal, from slavery to freedom, or from the era of Satanic control to the reign of God. So the transition from selfishness and immorality to goodness is also due to Christ. How Christ produces the moral transformation, Paul does not attempt to say. It is enough to know that he does effect it. There were plenty of men and women in Corinth and Ephesus who really were transformed. We die with Christ to sin; we rise with Christ to righteousness. But we shall not do justice to the concreteness and objectivity even of Paul's ethics if we try to explain in our own terms what Paul does not explain at all. Thus it is not enough to say that Christ's example of goodness stimulates us to be good, or that his death on the cross stimulates us to understand God and so to see and forsake sin.

6

The place of this deeper explanation of the Christian's moral transformation is taken in Paul most nearly by what may be listed as sixth among our categories—the mystical. It includes all those inner changes, those new impulses and interior forces which give to the Christian life its new buoyancy and power and direction. It is hard enough for us to describe our own experiences, for they are too subjective. That is one reason why the word "mysticism" is so convenient; it is so vague in meaning. There is no doubt that Paul appreciated the existence of such an inner realm of religion and struggled to express it with such terms as he had. His terms are still quite materialistic and objective; perhaps our modern psychology has really not much better ones. But there is no reason to deny the existence of religious experience because we can describe it so inadequately. Our clumsiness and Paul's must be overlooked if we are not going to limit our analysis of religion to what is definable and thereby leave out what is the most important part of Paul. Indeed we are in danger of making it all important in Paul, as though this were truly religion and the first four categories were only theology—this one experience, the rest expression.

Now, except for the ethical, all the categories we have discussed so far are external; they lie in man's environment, in history, in God's treatment, or in the super-natural battle-field. Even ethics is in a sense outside a man, it is his observable conduct or behavior. But true religion has an inward phase, man's own act alongside of God's, man's will and motive as well as his deed. I must not stop to describe Paul's idea of man's inward make-up or to test his solution of the problems which consciousness injects into what otherwise might seem a purely material universe. He is frankly dualistic, as he really has to be, if he is going to keep to the way in which things naturally present themselves to the human mind. His dualism between flesh and spirit fits in with all his other antitheses. I must confine myself to the two commonest of his terms for the interior phase of religion.

One of these terms is faith. To believe or to trust combines in our usual way of speaking an act of reason and an act of will. But our usual way of speaking is very likely bad psychology. In any case what Paul means by faith is an attitude we seem voluntarily to take. It is our response to the objective facts in the other categories. For example, it means believing that our status is changed, that God has conquered Satan, that the day of the Lord will come, or that God has adopted his new plan. You cannot believe these things unless they have been presented to you. Hence the importance of announcing them; that is, of preaching the gospel. In relation to all four of these first categories, faith seems largely intellectual. To be sure, the intellectual appreciation of our new status with God goes further, just as any discovery that one is forgiven, or set free, or given an inheritance, is sure to go further than mere intellectual assent. Paul evidently believed the reaction from this discovery would affect conduct and would produce ethical results. Faith, therefore, is a profoundly moral attitude.

There is grave danger that we should make the mistake of thinking of Paul's faith as purely intellectual. Too often it has been expounded as mere assent to a proposition, like the signing of one's name to a creed. That the central fact of Paul's religion is not merely believing that something is so, is proved by the other terms he uses; for example, his other favorite formula, "in Christ Jesus." If the word "faith" or "believe" occurs in Paul's ten letters—noun and verb—150 times, we may note that the phrase "in Christ" or its equivalent occurs even oftener, 164 times. To be a Christian is for Paul to be in Christ. The hope of the future is a hope in the Lord; the mystery of God is a mystery in Christ: the changed status is salvation in Christ Jesus, or redemption in Christ Jesus, or being justified in Christ, or righteousness in Christ Jesus. Even faith is faith in Christ Jesus. These phrases and others like them baffle exact modern translation or explanation. Christ Jesus appears to be spoken of as a kind of new medium in which life is lived—like the atmosphere. Just as we live in the air and the air is in our bodies, so Paul can say both things of Christ. The Christian walks or stands in the Lord, and conversely Christ is revealed or formed in the Christian. Parallel with "those who are in Christ Jesus" is Paul's cry, "Christ liveth in me!" Note how he combines several terms in one passage: "With Christ I am crucified. It is no longer I who live but Christ lives in me—in faith I live." This is only the beginning of the list of varied expressions used by Paul for his mystical feeling.

What is this Christ Jesus in which Paul believes, in which he lives, and that lives in Paul? I have compared it with a kind of atmosphere or local medium. Paul makes a similar identification—for the word "Spirit" is used by Paul almost interchangeably with "Christ," and it means something rarefied, fluid, and immaterial like air. The Lord is the Spirit. The Spirit is in the Christian, and the Christian life is in the Spirit, just as the Christian and his Lord are reciprocally in each other.

Besides identifying Christ with the Spirit, Paul also nearly identifies this Christ with God. Among what later theology calls the three persons of the Trinity Paul makes very little distinction. Their names can often be exchanged in his phrases with no perceptible change of meaning. And so his Christ shares the qualities of both the others: from the Spirit the character of immaterial substance like air which we can live in and have in us; from God the qualities of personality with all the welcome figures of character, of feeling, and of interpersonal fellowship.

With the Jesus of history, as presented in the Gospels, Paul's Christ has little in common. The Apostle of Jesus Christ lays little stress on the life and teachings of his famous fellow-countryman who was executed at Calvary. But that made Paul's Christ none the less real to him. We of this age find reality in Christianity because it is connected with an incident in human history and because in Christ we see God in human form; God breaking through into our world, appearing at a specific place and time. At the name of Jesus we turn our thought backward to Galilee and Jerusalem; Paul turns within or lifts his eyes to heaven. If we cannot share Paul's confidence and his feeling of warmth and intimacy for his spiritual exalted

Christ, it is simply because we are different from Paul. But there have always been many devout persons to whom this kind of Christ gives more sense of reality than could the most confident acceptance of the story of a historical Jesus.

But this Christ—undefined, unhistorical, inapprehensible to our modern unmystical prejudices—was nevertheless the central point in Paul's mysticism. His simple creed is, "Jesus Christ is Lord." And Jesus Christ is also the unifying factor between all six categories of his religion.

THE ANCIENT WRONG

C. Harold Dodd

WE HAVE SEEN how Paul saw humanity in evil case, and how he devoted himself to its rescue from this evil case by "the revealing of the sons of God" as a closely knit Divine Commonwealth. More precisely, he saw mankind enslaved, and lived for its emancipation; and he saw it alienated, and lived for its reconciliation. Those are the two great words of the Pauline gospel: "redemption," "atonement." By this time they have become wholly theological terms, with their meaning confused by centuries of dogmatic definition. "Redemption" was the process by which a slave obtained his freedom. Thousands of Jews taken prisoners in the wars had been sold into slavery in the Roman dominions, and it was a popular work of benevolence for wealthy Jews to "redeem" them into liberty. That is the source of the metaphor. We shall therefore do well to use the term "emancipation" as the nearest equivalent of the Pauline expression. "Atonement" is an old English word meaning the restoration of unity ("at-one") between persons who are estranged. In *Richard II* Shakespeare makes the king say to the rival noblemen, Mowbray and Bolingbroke,

Since we cannot *atone* you, we shall see
Justice design the victor's chivalry.

The secondary meanings which the word has acquired are foreign to the language of Paul. In the Authorized Version of the New Testament "atonement" is the translation of a perfectly ordinary Greek word for the reconciliation of estranged persons. Paul saw men divided into hostile camps "biting and devouring one another." Behind that internecine strife he saw the hostility of men to God their common Father. Get rid of the enmity toward God, and the divisions of men may be overcome. "While we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son": "He is our peace, who made both one, and broke down that dividing wall, our enmity." "Reconciliation," then, of the estranged, "emancipation" of the enslaved, are the cardinal points of Paul's Gospel.

We have now to ask, What is the enslaving force, and what is the cause of the alienation? To those questions, Paul gives one answer, Sin. That word too, however, he used in a sense different from that in which it has come to be used in modern theology and ethics. To understand his view of sin we must make our way through some rather tangled metaphysics.

Paul conceived reality in a dualistic way. There are two planes of being,

From *The Meaning of Paul for To-day*, London, 1920, pp. 54-65. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

the one eternal, the other temporal; the one visible, the other invisible. The visible world is in some sort a revelation of the invisible, but an imperfect revelation, for it is entangled in a mesh of decay ("corruption"). Decay is, in fact, so inseparable a property of the visible world that Paul gives us no other general term for its material substance. He simply calls it "decay," describing it by its most evident property rather than defining it. Similarly, he describes the substance, if we may so call it, of the invisible world as "splendour" ("glory"), and he may have conceived it, with many Greek thinkers, as akin to light and fire.

The cosmical aspect of the question, however, is only vaguely touched upon. It is only in man that Paul shows us anything approaching a complete scheme of the relations of the two planes. For man belongs, at least potentially, to both. His bodily existence partakes of the nature of the temporal and visible: "he wears the image of the earthy." In him the visible substance is "flesh," material, and inevitably subject to decay. The flesh is temporarily animated by the *psyché* (if we use the word "soul" we are suggesting false implications), which is the principle of conscious life, including even intellectual processes, but not belonging to the heavenly or eternal order. On the other hand is the "inner man," whose nature is different. About the inner man in the non-Christian, Paul is somewhat vague; but it appears that the "reason" by which God is known to all men, and the "heart" upon which His law is written, partake of the nature of the invisible and eternal world. The non-Christian is, however, to Paul's mind an imperfect, immature specimen of Man. It is in the Christian that we must study human nature in its developed form. Here the inner man is definitely described as "spirit" (*pneuma* as distinct from *psyché*). Like "flesh," spirit is a *continuum*; it is the form of being of God Himself and of the risen and glorified Christ, but it is also the form of being of the believer's own "inner man." Not that "spirit" is to be considered as if it were, like "flesh," more substance. It is essentially power, energy, and as such is "life-giving" ("quickening"). "Spirit" is therefore not properly a term of individual psychology. Every man, so far as he has attained to truly mature life, partakes both of flesh and of spirit.

The principle of individuality is the "organism" ("body.") This does not mean to Paul the structure of bone, flesh, and blood to which we give the name of body. It is the pure organic form which subsists through all changes of material particles. The physical organ which I possess today is different in all or most of its material particles from that which I possessed eight years ago. In so far as it has an organic identity and continuity it is my body none the less. Thus for Paul the identity of the "organism" or "body" was in nowise affected by any change in its substance. The "flesh" might pass away, and "splendour" or light-substance be substituted, and the organism remain intact and self-identical. Thus Paul's insistence on the resurrection of the "body" is meant to assert the continuity of individual identity, as distinguished from the persistence of some impalpable shade or "soul" which was not in any real sense the identical man. Paul could not have talked of "saving souls"; it was the "emancipation of the body" that inter-

ested him, i.e. of the individual, self-identical, organic whole. The phrase in the Apostles' Creed, "the resurrection of the flesh," would have horrified him. He neither expected nor wished the "flesh" to rise again; he wished the "body" to be emancipated from the bonds of the "flesh." It is probably on this analogy that we are meant to interpret the "emancipation of the creation." It, too, has somehow a "body" which can be redeemed from decay and clothed with splendour in the eternal world.

The metaphysical distinction of two planes of being does not precisely correspond to ethical distinctions. It is often stated that Paul accepted a current view of his time, that spirit alone is good and matter essentially evil. He did not accept any such view. On the one hand there are "spiritual forces of wickedness"; and on the other hand what is wrong with the material world is not its moral evil, but its subjection to the futility of a perpetual flux of birth and decay. That subjection is traced not, as in some contemporary theories, to the sin of Adam, for whose sake the earth was believed to have been "cursed," but vaguely to the will of God, i.e. it is in the nature of things as they are, though not of necessity permanent.

In man, however, the case is complicated. By some means the "flesh" of mankind (which carries with it the *psyché*) has fallen under the dominion of sin, thus becoming not merely morally indifferent, though perishable matter, but "flesh of sin." This Sin is a mysterious power, not native to man or to the material world, but intruding into human nature on its lower side. Paul speaks of it in personal terms: it lives, reigns, holds us in slavery; it is condemned and overcome. Whether he was consciously personifying an abstraction, or whether Sin was for him really a personal power, like the Devil of popular mythology, is not clear. At all events it is not an inherent taint in matter, but rather one of the "spiritual forces of wickedness."

How Sin came into human nature is a question which Paul does not answer very satisfactorily. He sometimes traces it to an historic transgression of a human ancestor in the remote past. This was the common account given in contemporary Judaism. But in other passages he suggests a different origin. In the background of his world stand the "world-rulers" or "elemental spirits." They have some special relation to the material world, and it does not appear that in relation to it they are necessarily evil. But if man becomes subject to them, then he is fallen to a state of unnatural slavery. The process appears to be after this fashion: the reason of man, being a spark of the divine, knew God and read His law written on the heart; but instead of worshipping God and doing His will, it stooped to adore material forms, and thereby fell under the dominion of the elemental powers. The elevation of the material to the place of God led to the perversion of man's naturally right instincts. Reason itself became "reprobate" and the whole life of mankind was thrown into disorder. If the transmitted sin of Adam is the characteristically Jewish doctrine, the theory of elemental spirits starts rather from Greek ideas. Neither can satisfy us, though each has hints of truth: on the one hand, the solidarity of humanity and the incalculable effects of individual transgression; on the other, the peril of ex-

alting the physical and material to a dominance which is not in accord with man's real nature.

What might have been the relations of flesh and spirit had not sin intervened is a question on which Paul does not speculate. Taking things as they are, he scans history and sees that everywhere the power of evil has degraded man from the high estate he should hold, making even the "inner man," the reason which knew God, the conscience which witnessed to His law, slave to the material part and sharer in its fate of decay and futility. In the "flesh" sin has its seat. Reason may bow to the "flesh" and thereby fall under the dominion of sin and decay, but its nature remains alien from sin. "Flesh," on the other hand, has assimilated itself to the evil power, and the taint passes to the *psyché* or "soul" of which it is the organ, so that "the desires of the flesh and of the intellect" stand for the evil tendency in man. "The Flesh" therefore, in a moral sense, does not mean matter as evil in itself, but man's emotional and intellectual nature as perverted by sin and enslaved to material forces.

It will be evident from this that "sin" is not for Paul identical with actual moral transgression of which the individual is fully conscious and for which he is fully responsible. That is the sense in which the word has been generally used by subsequent writers; but if it is taken in that sense, then Paul is inevitably misunderstood. The actual Greek word used (*hamartia*), like its equivalent in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, originally meant "missing the mark," or as we might say, "going wrong." Now whatever subtleties may complicate the discussion of such questions as moral responsibility and degrees of merit, at least it is plain that there is something wrong with mankind. There is a racial, a corporate, a social wrongness of which we are made in some sense partakers by the mere fact of our being born into human society. That is the meaning of "original sin," as the theologians call it. It is not the figment of an inherited guilt; how could anything so individual as guilty responsibility be inherited? It is a corporate wrongness in which we are involved by being men in this world. The purport of Paul's rather clumsy metaphysics is to show how the problem of evil in man is more than the problem of a series of sinful acts, which of his own free will he can stop if he makes up his mind to it. To some minds this distinction will seem artificial. They will agree with the child who refused to repeat the prayer "God make me a good girl," with the remark, "I wouldn't trouble God about a little thing like that: I can be good by myself if I want to." But a majority, perhaps, of those who take life seriously find that the trouble lies deeper. There is a deep-grained wrongness about human life as it is. The preoccupation with that wrongness as the primary interest of the religious life is certainly morbid; but no matter how freely and fully we recognize the wonderful potentialities of that human nature which we share, it remains true that there is a flaw somewhere, which defies simple treatment.

The monstrous development of the doctrine of "total depravity" and the reaction against it, have partly blinded us to the reality of what Paul called "sin in the flesh." That blindness has been partly connected with a fuller

appreciation of individuality and individual responsibility than Paul had attained. But have we not placed an exaggerated emphasis upon individual responsibility? And is not that partly why the whole idea of sin (in the sense in which evangelical theology has used the term) has seemed to be invalidated by the modern re-discovery of solidarity, and the recognition of the influence of heredity and social environment? It would indeed be difficult to say definitely of any particular wrong act that its perpetrator was absolutely and exclusively responsible for it. When we have said that, it is often thought that the whole Christian doctrine of sin is disproved. It does not touch that doctrine as taught by Paul. He thought of the "flesh," or lower nature of man, as a *continuum* in which we all partake; and of that "flesh" as having acquired by some means an impulse towards what is wrong. We should set aside his terminology, and seek some other explanation of the fact; but on the fact we must surely agree with Paul, that there is something common, something racial about sin in his sense of the term. It is a tendency transmitted by heredity and deepened by environment, and its issues, like its sources, are not individual merely, but racial. No one of us can disown his part in the complicated evils in which society is entangled. We are wrong, and we need to be put right. No casuistry explaining away the measure of individual responsibility makes much difference here: the fact of wrongness remains. Our problem is Paul's problem. Indeed, with the modern emphasis on solidarity, and our rebelliousness against social evil in the world, the problem is pressing on us with a peculiar urgency. Perhaps, therefore, we may give ear afresh to a teacher out of that ancient imperial world when he sets before us his thoughts upon its solution. As we shall see, he finds the point of attack upon this gigantic force of wrong in the individual, though not in the individual as an isolated unit.

For the moment, however, we are concerned to pursue the trail of corporate wrong. For it brings disastrous consequences which also are corporate as well as individual. Human history is a moral order, in which it is impossible to be wrong without incurring disaster. This disaster Paul calls, in traditional language, "The Wrath," or much more rarely, "The Wrath of God." It has been supposed that Paul thought of God as a vengeful despot, angry with men whom nevertheless He had Himself created with the liability to err, even if He did not create them to be damned for His greater glory. That is a mere caricature of Paul's view. There are, indeed, many indications in his use of language that "The Wrath of God" is not being thought of as a passion of anger in the mind of God. It is not without significance that there are no more than three or possibly four passages where the expression "The Wrath of God" (or "His Wrath") appears at all, while the phrase "The Wrath" is constantly used in a curiously impersonal way. Paul carefully avoids ever making God the subject of the verb "to be angry." Once he speaks of God as "applying the Wrath"—a strange way of saying that God made His anger felt, if anger was thought of as a passion in the divine mind. It suggests rather a process directed or controlled by a person. Even in the passage which has about it most of the sterner colours of Pharisaic theology the "vessels of Wrath" are the objects

of God's forbearance; a statement which, if it does not rule out the idea that God is angry with the persons on whom at the same time He shows mercy, at least gives a startling paradox if Paul is supposed to have the thought of an angry God in mind.

Let us, then, consider the one passage where "The Wrath of God" is spoken of in more than an allusive way. "The Wrath of God is being revealed," he says to the Romans: it is to be seen at work in contemporary history. How, then? In earthquake, fire and brimstone? "God gave them up in the lusts of their own hearts to impurity"; "God gave them up to disgraceful passions"; "God gave them up to their reprobate reason." "The Wrath of God," therefore, as seen in actual operation, consists in leaving sinful human nature to "stew in its own juice." This is a sufficiently terrible conception, but if we believe, as Paul did, in any measure of human free will, what else is to happen if men choose steadfastly to ignore God? Are they not self-condemned to the reaping of the harvest of their sinful deeds, which is "a reprobate reason"—a disordered moral being, where the very instincts that should have led to good are perverted to the service of wrong? "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" And this "reprobation," be it observed, is the consequence of the rejection of that knowledge of God which is native to man. "The Wrath," then, is revealed before our eyes as the increasing horror of sin working out its hideous law of cause and effect. "The judgment" which overtakes sin is the growing perversion of the whole moral atmosphere of human society, which cannot but affect to a greater or less degree every individual born into it. Meanwhile, the characteristic personal activity of God is not wrath but "kindness," "long-suffering," rooted in His love and ready to display itself in "grace." That is why "The Wrath" is not the last word of the moral order for Paul. The "wages of sin" is real and terrible; it is moral decay and death for the race. But that is not a complete account of the moral universe. "God justifies the ungodly." To this matter we shall presently turn. The intention of this chapter is to set forth the problem of sin as Paul faced it, and to suggest how close to reality he was when he placed his finger on the point that sin is a racial and social fact, in which every individual is implicated, and that if the moral order is nothing more than a law of retribution, there is nothing before sinful man but greater sin and moral disaster.

The whole of this is only preparatory to a decisive declaration of the way out of apparently desperate conditions. Even so, does it give too gloomy a view? We like to think that humanity left to itself would grow better. But would it? Is it not true that whole nations and societies of men have sunk lower and lower out of sheer inner rottenness, often bringing other peoples down with them in their fall, since there is a solidarity of mankind? And is such a future for our species as the ghastly imaginings of Mr. Wells's "Time Machine" wholly inconceivable? But Jesus Christ, we are told, whom Paul professed to follow, took no such gloomy view of human nature and its prospects. It may be granted at once that there is a difference of emphasis between the Master and His disciple. There was a good reason

for this. Jesus worked among the Jews, where the dominant theology took a gloomy enough view of the nature of all men except a very few. It was therefore His first and chief care to give hope to those who seemed hopeless and to assure them of the glorious possibilities open to them in the love of the Father in heaven. Paul worked among the pagans, where real down-right evil was readily condoned and glozed over, and its inevitable consequences explained away, while none the less the rottenness of sin was eating into the heart of that corrupt civilization, despite all the efforts of moralists and legislators. "The Wrath" that follows sin was actually being revealed; and it was part of Paul's task to open the eyes of the pagan world to it, that they might be willing to seek the better way. But we cannot quote Jesus against Paul as giving an easy and cheerfully optimistic view of the actual state of human society. On the contrary, there is enough in His teaching to show that He too saw the society of His day "rushing down a steep place into the sea," with no hope of its redemption save in the "Sovereignty of God." Therein Paul was His true interpreter to the wider world.

JESUS

Karl Barth

vv. 21, 22a. But now apart from the law the righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God through his faithfulness in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe.

But now. We stand here before an irresistible and all-embracing dissolution of the world of time and things and men, before a penetrating and ultimate KRISIS, before the supremacy of a negation by which all existence is rolled up. The world is the world; and we now know what that means (i. 18—iii. 20). But whence comes this KRISIS? Whence comes our recognition of it and our ability to comprehend it? Whence comes the possibility of our perceiving that the world is the world, and of our thus limiting it as such by contrasting it with another world which is unknown to us? Whence comes the possibility of our describing time only as time, and things only as things, and men only as men? and whence the possibility of our assigning a value to history and existence by sternly recognizing that they are concrete, limited, and relative? From what lofty eminence do all these critical opinions descend? And out of what abyss arises our knowledge of these last, unknown things, by which everything is measured, this shattering knowledge of the invisible Judge in whose hands lies our condemnation? All these questions revolve round one point, which is our origin, and sound one presupposition, from which our existence has emerged. From this presupposition we have come, and, regarded from this point, the world and we ourselves are seen to be bounded, dissolved, rolled up, and judged. But this one point is not a point among other points, and this one presupposition is not one among many presuppositions. Our origin evokes in us a memory of our habitation with the Lord of heaven and earth; and at this reminiscence the heavens are rent asunder, the graves are opened, the sun stands still upon Gibeon, and the moon stays in the valley of Ajalon. *But now* directs our attention to time which is beyond time, to space which has no locality, to impossible possibility, to the gospel of transformation, to the imminent Coming of the Kingdom of God, to affirmation in negation, to salvation in the world, to acquittal in condemnation, to eternity in time, to life in death—I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away. This is the Word of God.

Apart from the law. That God speaks, that we, known by Him, see ourselves and the world in His light, is something strange, peculiar, new;

From *The Epistle to the Romans*, sixth edition, translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns, London, 1933, pp. 91-104. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Oxford University Press.

and this "otherness" runs through all religions, all experience, and every disposition of men, when these are directed towards God. This "otherness" cuts sharply through all human sense of possession and semi-possession, even through all sense of not-possessing. It is the meaning of all ecclesiastical and religious history, nay, of all history; meaning which, for this reason, cannot be identified with any period or epoch of history or even with any underlying experience in history—for even such experience itself shares in the general ambiguity of all history. It is the confirmation of all these concrete and spiritual factors in the history of religion which we have named the impress of revelation, of all forms of worship, and, in the broadest sense of the word, of all "beliefs"; confirmation which, for this reason, must not be identified with the things which are confirmed, as though it were a visible thing in the midst of other things, and not, on the contrary, visible only in its invisibility. The voice of God which is His *power* (i. 16) is and remains the voice of God; were it not so, and did it not remain beyond all other voices, it would not be the *POWER* of God. God speaks where there is *law*; but He speaks also where there is no law. He speaks where law is, not because law is there, but because He willeth to speak. God is free.

The righteousness of God. The word of God declares that He is what He is. By committing Himself to men and to the world which has been created by Him, and by His unceasingly accepting them and it, He justifies Himself to Himself. Even the wrath of God is His righteousness (i. 18). To unbelief, His righteousness is necessarily manifested as divine negation. God makes Himself known as Creator and Lord of all things through His anger against unbelief, through the compulsion by which He drives men helplessly on to the barrier which hems them in, and hands them over to the god of this world (i. 20, 21). In this negation God affirms Himself and pronounces His claim upon men to be decisive, permanent, and final. Beyond the barrier at which we stand is—God. This is the theme of the Word of God. The more we become aware of the piercing irresistibility of this Word, the more powerfully and clearly will God speak to us of His justice and of His Kingdom; the more everything human—our good and evil, our belief and unbelief—becomes transparent as glass, the more pronouncedly do we—as we are seen and known by God—stand under His sovereignty and under the operation of His power. The righteousness of God is that "nevertheless" by which He associates us with Himself and declares Himself to be our God. This "nevertheless" contradicts every human logical "consequently", and is itself incomprehensible and without cause or occasion, because it is the "nevertheless!" of God. The will of God brooks no questioning: because He is God, He wills. The righteousness of God is His forgiveness, the radical alteration of the relation between God and man which explains why, though human unrighteousness and ungodliness have brought the world to its present condition and are intolerable to Him, He nevertheless continues to name us His people in order that we may *BE* His people. The righteousness of God is righteousness from outside—*justitia forensis*, *justitia aliena*; for the Judge pronounces His verdict ac-

according to the standard of His righteousness only. Unlike any other verdict, His verdict is creative: He pronounces us, His enemies, to be His friends. "Here therefore is the sermon of sermons and the wisdom of heaven; in order that we may believe that our righteousness and salvation and comfort come to us from outside; in order that we may believe that, though in us dwells naught but sin and unrighteousness and folly, we are, nevertheless, acceptable before God, righteous and holy and wise" (Luther). The righteousness of God is the action which sets free the truth that we have imprisoned (i. 18), and which is wholly independent of every attempt, or imaginable attempt, that we could make to achieve liberty. The righteousness of God is therefore the sovereign and regal display of the power of God: it is the miracle of resurrection. The righteousness of God is our standing-place in the air—that is to say, where there is no human possibility of standing—whose foundations are laid by God Himself and supported always by Him only; the place where we are wholly in His hands for favour or disfavour. This is the righteousness of God; and it is a positive relation between God and man. "We can neither doubt nor surrender this article of faith—though heaven and earth and every corruptible thing fall in ruins about us" (Luther). In the light of some 150,000 years of human insecurity, can we even consider any other positive relation? Can we even for one moment conceive of the emergence of some concrete or direct, historical or spiritual, relation? European history apart, can Asiatic or African or American history provide any other answer than God alone, God Himself, and the mercy of God?

That God is righteous—***hath been manifested***. This is the answer to our question "where?", the meaning of our "thence", our *But now*. The mercy of God triumphs! It has been given to us. The positive relation between God and man, which is the absolute paradox, veritably exists. This is the theme of the Gospel (i. 1, 16), proclaimed in fear and trembling, but under pressure of a necessity from which there is no escape. It proclaims eternity as an event. We declare the knowledge of the Unknown God, the Lord of heaven and earth, who dwelleth not in temples made with hands, who needeth not anything, seeing that He himself giveth to all life and breath and all things. We set forth everything given by God to men, as given in order that they may seek Him who is not far from each one of us, in whom we live and move and have our being, who is beyond all our life and movement and existence, and whose nature is to remain faithful, in spite of human depravity. We proclaim that, because it is His nature to remain faithful, the Godhead cannot be graven into any likeness by the skill and device of men; that God has overlooked the times of ignorance, *but that now* He commandeth men everywhere to repent. We announce the dawning of the day in which He will judge the world of men in righteousness—in His righteousness! (Acts xvii. 23-31). The righteousness of God ****hath been manifested****. We can no longer omit to reckon with it; we can no longer see what has been given otherwise than in the light of this previous giving. We can come from nowhere except from this pre-supposition. Henceforward the negation in which we stand

can be understood only in the light of the divine affirmation from which it proceeds. This means that the marks of human unrighteousness and ungodliness are crossed by the deeper marks of the divine forgiveness; that the discord of human defiance is penetrated by the undertones of the divine melody "Nevertheless." Once the revelation is given, our situation can never be otherwise; if, that is to say, we believe what has been revealed, and if we perceive that men have been dissolved by God, and therefore exalted to be with Him. By faith in the revelation of God we see men bounded, confined, and barred in, but even this is the operation of God. We see men under judgment, yet nevertheless thereby set aright. We see sense in the non-sense of history. We see that truth has burst its bonds. We see in men more than *flesh*. We see salvation breaking through. We see the faithfulness of God remaining firm, even though the noblest human hopes and expectations are dashed to the ground. And so, now that we have beheld what has appeared, been manifested, and displayed, we advance to meet the world, our conversation is of this revelation, and we are occupied in bringing the revelation of God to the notice of those who have eyes to see and ears to hear.

The revelation of the righteousness of God is—**witnessed by the law and the prophets**: it has been *proclaimed long ago* (i. 2). Abraham saw the day when God would judge the world in righteousness; Moses saw it also; the Prophets saw it; Job and the Psalmists saw it. We are encompassed by a cloud of witnesses who stood, all of them, in the light of this day; for the meaning of every epoch in history is directly related to God. In His righteousness every promise is fulfilled. The righteousness of God is the meaning of all religion, the answer to every human hope and desire and striving and waiting, and it is especially the answer to all that human activity which is concentrated upon hope. The righteousness of God is that upon which the whole existence and inevitability of the world is founded, and it is peculiarly visible when the world stands under the negation of judgment. It is the meaning of history, and especially of the complaint of history against its own inadequacy. It is the redemption of all creation, and most particularly when the creature knows itself to be no more than a creature, and so points beyond itself. Wherever there is an impress of revelation—and does anything whatsoever lack this mark?—there is a witness to the Unknown God, even if it be no more than an ignorant and superstitious worship of the most terrible kind (Acts xvii. 22, 23). Where have there not been *certain of your own poets who also* have said it (Acts xvii. 28)? Where there is experience, there is also the possibility of understanding. We proclaim no new thing; we proclaim the essential truth in everything that is old; we proclaim the incorruptible of which all corruptible is a parable. Our theme, therefore, is the theme concerning which the parables speak and to which they bear witness; the theme which eyes have seen and ears heard, and in which men have veritably believed; we proclaim the theme of the Church, which has been believed by all men, everywhere, and at all times.

The righteousness of God is manifested—**through his faithfulness in**

Jesus Christ. The faithfulness of God is the divine patience according to which He provides, at sundry times and at many divers points in human history, occasions and possibilities and witnesses of the knowledge of His righteousness. Jesus of Nazareth is the point at which it can be seen that all the other points form one line of supreme significance. He is the point at which is perceived the crimson thread which runs through all history. Christ—the righteousness of God Himself—is the theme of this perception. The faithfulness of God and Jesus the Christ confirm one another. The faithfulness of God is established when we meet the Christ in Jesus. Consequently, in spite of all our inadequacy, we are able to recognize the veritable possibility of the action of God in all His divers witnesses in history; consequently also, we are able to discover in the traces of the righteousness of God in the world more than mere chance occurrences, and are in a position to see that our own position in time is pregnant with eternal promise, if—nay, because!—we meet truth of another order at one point in time, at one place in that time which is illuminated throughout by reality and by the answer of God. The Day of Jesus Christ is the Day of all days; the brilliant and visible light of this one point is the hidden invisible light of all points; to perceive the righteousness of God once and for all here is the *hope of righteousness* (Gal. v. 5) everywhere and at all times. By the knowledge of Jesus Christ all human waiting is guaranteed, authorized, and established; for He makes it known that it is not men who wait, but God—in His faithfulness. Our discovery of the Christ in Jesus of Nazareth is authorized by the fact that every manifestation of the faithfulness of God points and bears witness to what we have actually encountered in Jesus. The hidden authority of the Law and the Prophets is the Christ who meets us in Jesus. Redemption and resurrection, the invisibility of God and a new order, constitute the meaning of every religion; and it is precisely this that compels us to stand still in the presence of Jesus. All human activity is a cry for forgiveness; and it is precisely this that is proclaimed by Jesus and that appears concretely in Him. The objection that this hidden power of forgiveness and, in fact, the whole subject-matter of religion, is found elsewhere, is wholly wide of the mark, since it is precisely we who have been enabled to make this claim. In Jesus we have discovered and recognized the truth that God is found everywhere and that, both before and after Jesus, men have been discovered by Him. In Him we have found the standard by which all discovery of God and all being discovered by Him is made known as such; in Him we recognize that this finding and being found is the truth of the order of eternity. Many live their lives in the light of redemption and forgiveness and resurrection; but that we have eyes to see their manner of life we owe to the One. In His light we see light. That it is the Christ whom we have encountered in Jesus is guaranteed by our finding in Him the sharply defined, final interpretation of the Word of the faithfulness of God to which the Law and the Prophets bore witness. His entering within the deepest darkness of human ambiguity and abiding within it is *THE* faithfulness. The life of Jesus is perfected obedience to the will of the faithful God. Jesus stands

among sinners as a sinner; He sets Himself wholly under the judgment under which the world is set; He takes His place where God can be present only in questioning about Him; He takes the form of a slave; He moves to the cross and to death; His greatest achievement is a negative achievement. He is not a genius, endowed with manifest or even with occult powers; He is not a hero or leader of men; He is neither poet nor thinker:—*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Nevertheless, precisely in this negation, He is the fulfilment of every possibility of human progress, as the Prophets and the Law conceive of progress and evolution, because He sacrifices to the incomparably Greater and to the invisibly Other every claim to genius and every human heroic or aesthetic or psychic possibility, because there is no conceivable human possibility of which He did not rid Himself. Herein He is recognized as the Christ; for this reason God hath exalted Him; and consequently He is the light of the Last Things by which all men and all things are illuminated. In Him we behold the faithfulness of God in the depths of Hell. The Messiah is the end of mankind, and here also God is found faithful. On the day when mankind is dissolved the new era of the righteousness of God will be inaugurated.

Unto all them that believe. Here is the necessary qualification. The vision of the New Day remains an indirect vision; in Jesus revelation is a paradox, however objective and universal it may be. That the promises of the faithfulness of God have been fulfilled in Jesus the Christ is not, and never will be, a self-evident truth, since in Him it appears in its final hiddenness and its most profound secrecy. The truth, in fact, can never be self-evident, because it is a matter neither of historical nor of psychological experience, and because it is neither a cosmic happening within the natural order, nor even the most supreme event of our imaginings. Therefore it is not accessible to our perception: it can neither be dug out of what is unconsciously within us, nor apprehended by devout contemplation, nor made known by the manipulation of occult psychic powers. These exercises, indeed, render it the more inaccessible. It can neither be taught nor handed down by tradition, nor is it a subject of research. Were it capable of such treatment, it would not be universally significant, it would not be the righteousness of God for the whole world, salvation for all men. Faith is conversion: it is the radically new disposition of the man who stands naked before God and has been wholly impoverished that he may procure the one pearl of great price; it is the attitude of the man who for the sake of Jesus has lost his own soul. Faith is the faithfulness of God, ever secreted in and beyond all human ideas and affirmations about Him, and beyond every positive religious achievement. There is no such thing as mature and assured possession of faith: regarded psychologically, it is always a leap into the darkness of the unknown, a flight into empty air. Faith is not revealed to us by *flesh and blood* (Matt. xvi. 17): no one can communicate it to himself or to any one else. What I heard yesterday I must hear again to-day; and if I am to hear it afresh to-morrow, it must be revealed by the Father of Jesus, who is in heaven, and by Him only. The revelation which is in Jesus, because it is the revelation of the righteousness

of God, must be the most complete veiling of His incomprehensibility. In Jesus, God becomes veritably a secret: He is made known as the Unknown, speaking in eternal silence; He protects himself from every intimate companionship and from all the impertinence of religion. He becomes a scandal to the Jews and to the Greeks foolishness. In Jesus the communication of God begins with a rebuff, with the exposure of a vast chasm, with the clear revelation of a great stumbling-block. "Remove from the Christian Religion, as Christendom has done, its ability to shock, and Christianity, by becoming a direct communication, is altogether destroyed. It then becomes a tiny superficial thing, capable neither of inflicting deep wounds nor of healing them; by discovering an unreal and merely human compassion, it forgets the qualitative distinction between man and God" (Kierkegaard). Faith in Jesus, like its theme, the righteousness of God, is the radical "Nevertheless". Faith in Jesus is to feel and comprehend the unheard of "love-less" love of God, to do the ever scandalous and outrageous will of God, to call upon God in His incomprehensibility and hiddenness. To believe in Jesus is the most hazardous of all hazards. This "Nevertheless", this unheard of action, this hazard, is the road to which we direct men. We demand faith, no more and no less; and we make this demand, not in our own name, but in the name of Jesus, in whom we have encountered it irresistibly. We do not demand belief in our faith; for we are aware that, in so far as faith originates in us, it is unbelievable. We do not demand from others our faith; if others are to believe, they must do so, as we do, entirely at their own risk and because of the promise. We demand faith in Jesus; and we make this demand here and now upon all, whatever may be the condition of life in which they find themselves. There are, however, no preliminaries necessary to faith, no required standard of education or intelligence, no peculiar temper of mind or heart, no special economic status. There are no human avenues of approach, no "way of salvation"; to faith there is no ladder which must be first scaled. Faith is its own initiation, its own presupposition. Upon whatever rung of the ladder of human life men may happen to be standing—whether they be Jews or Greeks, old or young, educated or uneducated, complex or simple—in tribulation or in repose they are capable of faith. The demand of faith passes diagonally across every type of religious or moral temperament, across every experience of life, through every department of intellectual activity, and through every social class. For all faith is both simple and difficult; for all alike it is a scandal, a hazard, a "Nevertheless"; to all it presents the same embarrassment and the same promise; for all it is a leap into the void. And it is possible for all, only because for all it is equally impossible.

vv. 22b-24. For there is no distinction: for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

.

All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God. Here is exposed the cause of the dissolution of every distinction. The remarkable union is

attested by a remarkable separation. There is no positive possession of men which is sufficient to provide a foundation for human solidarity; for every positive possession—religious temperament, moral consciousness, humanitarianism—already contains within itself the seed of the disruption of society. These positive factors are productive of difference, since they distinguish men from one another. Genuine fellowship is grounded upon a negative: it is grounded upon what men lack. Precisely when we recognize that we are sinners do we perceive that we are brothers. Our solidarity with other men is alone adequately grounded, when with others—or apart from them, since we may not wait for them!—we stretch out beyond everything that we are and have, and behold the wholly problematical character of our present condition. Men fall short of the glory of God. . . . Both Jew and Greek are set under one condemnation. Our deepest and final deprivation—a deprivation just as real whether we accept or deny the world as it is!—is recognized when we perceive the true and original humanity which lies beyond this world. In his PURITY man is set within the domain of the mercy of God.

Being justified (declared righteous) **freely by his grace**. When we are enabled to hear nothing except the word of the Judge, by which he asserts Himself and by which He upholdeth all things (Heb. i. 3), we know that we stand assuredly and genuinely before God. Our hearing can then be nothing more than faith in God, faith that He is because He is. So long as we are swayed by any other motive except faith, we do not stand before God. Thus all distinctions between men are seen to be trivial. *God declares*: He declares His Righteousness to be the Truth behind and beyond all human righteousness and unrighteousness. He declares that He has espoused our cause, and that we belong to Him. He declares that we, His enemies, are His beloved children. He declares His decision to erect His justice by the complete renewal of heaven and of earth. This declaration is *creatio ex nihilo*, creation out of nothing. Uttered by God from His tribunal, it is grounded in Him alone, and is without occasion or condition. Such creation is assuredly genuine creation, the creation of the divine righteousness in us and in the world. When God speaks, it is done. But the creation is a new creation; it is not a mere new eruption, or extension, or unfolding, of that old “creative evolution” of which we form a part, and shall remain a part, till our lives’ end. Between the old and the new creation is set always the end of this man and of this world. The “Something” which the Word of God creates is of an eternal order, wholly distinct from every “something” which we know otherwise. It neither emerges from what we know, nor is it a development of it. Compared with our “something” it is and remains always—nothing. However true it is that—THIS mortal must put on immortality, and THIS corruptible must put on incorruption; nevertheless—*Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*—inasmuch as the *putting on* is an act of God, and not a human action, this mortal remains mortal and subject to corruption: he awaits a radical and qualitative change, a transformation; he awaits, in fact, the Resurrection of the Dead (1 Cor. xv. 50-7). *We await a new heaven and a*

new earth. The Righteousness of God in us and in the world is not a particular form of human righteousness competing with other forms; rather, *your life is hid with Christ in God* (Col. iii. 3). If it be not hidden, it is not Life! The Kingdom of God has not "broken forth" upon the earth, not even the tiniest fragment of it; and yet, it has been *proclaimed*; it has not come, not even in its most sublime form; and yet, it is *nigh at hand*. The Kingdom of God remains a matter of faith, and most of all is the revelation of it in Christ Jesus a matter of faith. It is heralded and it is nigh at hand as a new world, not as the continuation of the old. "Our" righteousness can be genuine and permanent only as the Righteousness of God. By *new* must always be understood the eternal world in the reflection of which we stand here and now. The mercy of God which is directed towards us can be true, and can remain true, only as a miracle—"vertical from above". When the mercy of God is thought of as an element in history or as a factor in human spiritual experience, its untruth is emphasized. We stand really before God, inasmuch as we await in faith the realization of His Word, and inasmuch as we perpetually recognize that the declaration that we are justified by God in His Presence takes place *freely by his grace*, and only by His grace. Grace is the generous and free will of God, His will to accept us; its necessity proceeds from Him and from Him only. The necessity of the promise of God that those who in a pure heart lack His glory shall see Him face to face; the necessity that the imprisoned Truth of God shall break its chains; the necessity that God shall maintain and show forth His faithfulness, without any provision by us of an occasion for its display—but simply because He is God; all this necessity is the majestic pre-eminence of grace. Grace is, then, no spiritual power residing in the man of this world; no physical energy residing in Nature; no cosmic power in this earth. Grace is and remains always the Power of God (i. 16), the promise of a new man, of a new nature, of a new world: it is the promise of the Kingdom of God. Grace is and remains always in this world negative, invisible, and hidden; the mark of its operation is the declaration of the passing of this world and of the end of all things. Restless, and terribly shattering, grace completely overthrows the foundations of this world; and yet, on the Day of days, the creative Word of God veritably declares the operation of grace to be no mere negation. Grace is altogether "Yes"; it is salvation, comfort, and edification. Through the dissolution of the outer man the inner man is renewed day by day. But all this is true on the Day of all days through the creating Word; and it must be believed on, because the creative Word of God has promised it; and we can believe in it, if our eyes be fixed upon the Day of fulfilment which has been announced in Jesus.

This creative word is spoken—through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

What is there, then, in Christ Jesus? There is that which horrifies: the dissolution of history in history, the destruction of the structure of events within their known structure, the end of time in the order of time. *Hallowed be Thy name! Thy kingdom come! Thy will be done in earth*

as it is in heaven! The Son of man proclaims the death of the son of man, He proclaims God as First and Last; and the echo answers: *He taught them as one that had authority—He is beside himself—He deceiveth the people—A friend of publicans and sinners.* The answer bears unmistakable witness to the truth of what has been proclaimed. Jesus of Nazareth, *Christ after the flesh*, is one amongst other possibilities of history; but He is the possibility which possesses all the marks of impossibility. His life is a history within the framework of history, a concrete event in the midst of other concrete events, an occasion in time and limited by the boundaries of time; it belongs to the texture of human life. But it is history pregnant with meaning; it is concreteness which displays the Beginning and the Ending; it is time awakened to the memory of Eternity; it is humanity filled with the Voice of God. In this fragment of the world there is detached from this world—before the very eyes of men and in their actual hearings!—something which gleams in the darkness and gives to the world a new brilliance; and this “something” is—Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased!—God Himself, who willet to draw the whole world unto Himself, and to fashion a new heaven and a new earth. As yet we see but the image of this world and of its dominion. Mighty it is, and lifted up, and very magnificent, terrible to behold, an image of gold and silver, of iron and clay and brass. But in the hidden Life of Jesus we see also the stone fashioned and detached, which smites the image upon its feet and, without any aid from human hands, breaks it in pieces. The whole image is crushed, and the wind carries it away like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors. *But the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth* (Dan. ii. 24-35). Satan as lightning is fallen from heaven, his dominion is ended; the Kingdom of God is at hand, and the heralds of His Kingdom are assuredly present: *The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them; and—blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me.* He that gazes upon this earthly fragment of the world, and perceives in the life of Jesus, and beyond it, the redemption which shall come; he it is that hears the creative Voice of God, and looks henceforward for no other, but awaits all from this redemption and from this Voice of God (Matt. xi. 1-4). Blessed is he who believes what can only be BELIEVED, and what CAN only be believed because of that which is—in Christ Jesus.

HOW PAUL THOUGHT OF CHRIST

Harris Franklin Rall

WHAT, THEN, was distinctive and essential in Paul's view of Christ?

1. God was in Christ and Christ was of God. The two aspects are of equal importance. Paul's whole faith rested on the fact that in Christ God himself was speaking to man and dealing with him and entering human life. And for him the converse followed: Christ was of God and in God. Christ belonged in his spirit and life and inmost being on the side of God. So Paul could use interchangeably Spirit of Christ and Spirit of God just because the life of Christ was God's life. In the same way he ascribes the work of salvation, judgment, and creation now to Christ and now to God. To ascribe these to Christ is to ascribe them to God, since there is nothing of Christ which is not of God.

2. Yet for Paul there was only one God. No Jewish opponent ever charged him with being false to the monotheism of his people. Christ was not for him a second God. The three coordinate Beings of the Athanasian creed and of so much of popular Christian thought, Beings standing in a relation of absolute equality in which, except for the phrases about generation and procession, there is "no before nor after," this for him would have been incomprehensible. "There is no God but one," he wrote. For others, indeed, "there are gods many, and lords many"; yet to us there is one God, the Father . . . ; and one Lord, Jesus Christ." In innumerable passages and in solemn benediction the words are repeated, God the Father, Christ the Lord: not Father God and Christ God, but God who is Father, and Christ who is Lord. Paul holds clearly, as does the whole New Testament, to the subordination of Christ and the dependence of the Son upon the Father. He ascribes the highest of agencies to Christ in creation as well as revelation and salvation, but always in a frame of reference which looks to the one God who is over all. It is God who sends forth his Son, God who is reconciling men in Christ, God who raised Christ from the dead and gave him power that he should be Lord over all. The head of Christ is God. Christ is God's as we are Christ's. The exaltation of Christ is to the glory of God, and in the end the Son shall be subjected to the Father, "that God may be all in all." The suggestion of John Calvin, that the phrase, "Christ is God's," refers simply to Christ's humanity is a misinterpretation of Paul.

3. For Paul, Christ was an historical and human personage, and the fact was vital to Paul's gospel. He did not, like later theologians, think of an

From *According to Paul*, New York, 1944, pp. 125-29. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons.

abstraction called human "nature," which was conjoined with a divine "nature," or of a "humanity" which was "assumed" in some external fashion by a being come from heaven. Christ was not just man; he was *a* man, "born of the seed of David according to the flesh." It is true that Paul's supreme interest was in the living Christ, the Lord present in his Church and in the believer. It is wrong to conclude, however, that he was either ignorant or indifferent in relation to the historic Jesus. There are scores of references to him in the epistles. He refers to Jesus as man, as Jew, born of a woman, with brothers of whom one is named, under the law, sinless, obedient, filled with the spirit of holiness, with a circle of followers, instituting the Lord's Supper, weak, suffering, betrayed, dying on the cross, buried and raised from the dead. And beyond all this, remembering that Paul's letters are written for special occasions and situations, presupposing in most cases his previous teaching in person, it would be unwarranted to assume that in his regular work he did not make use of such materials of the common Christian tradition as are contained in the synoptic gospels.

More important still, the human Christ was a vital part of Paul's faith, essential in particular at three points. (1) Jesus was the revelation of man, the one into whom men were to grow up. In Christ's life and spirit, in his love and truth, his patience and pity, Paul saw the law of life which remained when the religion of law had passed. In his pure trust and utter obedience, and in his fellowship with the Father, he saw that to which God called men. Only as man could Christ be this revelation of man. (2) And, paradoxical as it might seem, only as man could he become the revelation of God. For in Paul's thought, the supreme revelation of God was the disclosure of his *love*, and this was seen in the love of him who in humility and suffering went to the cross. The power of God might be seen in the heavens but his character had to be revealed in a man. (3) Most important is the fact that for Paul the humanity of Jesus was essential to God's way of salvation. If it was needful that Christ should be from God and one with God, it was equally needful that he should be truly man and one with us. How strongly Paul felt the need of this identity with us is seen in his daring phrase about God's "sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." In Jesus God had actually become one with sinful humanity. Jesus had shown in his own person as man how the law might be fulfilled in those who walked "not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," how the Spirit of God might dwell in man. In his person Jesus as man was "the last Adam," the beginning of a new humanity, "the first-born among many brethren," the one to whom these others were to be conformed. In this human Jesus, in his life and death and resurrection, God's purpose of world redemption was being wrought out. Paul's idea of salvation, both individual and racial, demanded this conception of Jesus as a man. Upon this the Church has always insisted in its doctrine of salvation.

4. For Paul, Christ is not only the center and culmination of human history, but the final purpose and meaning of all creation is found in him. This is the explanation of those passages which relate Christ to creation.

The modern man finds it hard to understand Paul when he declares, "all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist." Paul is not here giving up his Hebrew monotheism or displacing God as Creator. God is still for him the world ground. But there is a telic explanation of things as well as a casual one. The "cause" of all things may be sought in the goal which lies ahead as well as in the power which is behind all things. In Christ Paul sees not only God's act of revelation and salvation and his final goal for man, but the meaning of creation itself. Hence he sees in Christ the why of all things and so the real cause of creation. Creation finds its explanation in salvation and both in Christ. So "all things have been created through him, and unto him." To this end all things were made, visible and invisible, in the heavens and upon the earth. And he gives unity to all, to the things of creation as to the events of history. That ideal unity is revealed in Christ; it will be achieved when through him God "reconciles all things unto himself." This is the meaning of the pregnant phrase of Colossians 1:17: "in him all things consist," that is, hang together, or have their unity. As Pascal said: "He who knows him, knows the meaning of all things."

.

THE PLACE OF APOCALYPTICAL CONCEPTIONS IN THE THOUGHT OF PAUL

Frank C. Porter

THE RESURRECTION of Christ was to Paul a fact of his own observation, and it was an eschatological event, and the first such event, as is clear in 1 Cor. 15:20-28. We have therefore to do in the case of Paul with one who regards last things as having already begun; and we shall see that there is involved in that fact a deep-going change in the signification of the apocalyptic ideas themselves. It is one thing to expect a supernatural intervention of God in the immediate future, the incoming of the heavenly world and its powers, bringing this present world to an end and bringing in the world to come, and quite another thing to believe that an event recently passed was the hoped for coming of God into the world, the overthrow of the powers of evil and the inauguration of the time of redemption and blessedness. Apocalyptic conceptions may no doubt be said to have an important place in the thought of a man who holds this remarkable opinion, but the nature of apocalyptic hopes will be so transformed by such a conception of their fulfilment that the word can only be used with caution. To Paul, on account of the life, death and resurrection of Christ, all things had become new, including his fundamental conceptions of the other world itself, and of the nature of the dualism which in one sense or another is at the foundation of the apocalyptic view of the world. The new age had dawned and its powers were present and were experienced; Paul found himself a new being in a new world; and yet all things outwardly remained as they were. The other world must therefore be within and not beyond. A spiritualizing of the apocalyptic hope would be necessarily involved in the conviction that the new age was in a real sense present; and it would seem that nothing could be clearer than that in Paul apocalyptic conceptions have been in principle, whether more or less consciously, spiritualized. The new man that Paul feels himself to be is the man in whom spirit dominates over flesh, the man in whom love has overcome selfishness, who no longer lives to himself. Yet Paul is one who can look forward as well as backward for the coming of the Lord, and outward as well as inward. Though things are still outwardly as they were before Christ rose, while inwardly all things are new, yet they are not always to be outwardly the same. Paul does not question the primitive Christian expectation of the coming of Christ, although it is his past coming that is the supreme crisis in world history. The apocalyptic,

therefore, comes into Paul's thought both as a means of interpreting the life and death and resurrection of Christ, and his present power as indwelling spirit to transform men's lives, and also as a hope for the speedy consummation of that redemption which is already a matter of experience. The central question that is before us therefore is that of the actual effect upon Paul's inherited ideas about the Day of the Lord and the World to Come, of Christ himself as a historical fact and as the present power of a new ethical life.

Whatever may be true about the eschatological ideas of Paul it is certainly true that he illustrates the fact that apocalyptical and spiritual conceptions can stand side by side in one mind, apocalyptical and prophetic, we may perhaps say, and that the question is not between the one and the other but is a problem of the degree and manner of the relationship between the two.

If Jewish apocalyptical conceptions lie at the foundation of Paul's Christian thought we should expect evidence of it in his use of literature. As a matter of fact his use of the Old Testament shows no interest in the more apocalyptical types of prophecy. He interprets the Old Testament in a Christian sense, but does not seem concerned to find in it predictions of this or that detail of the life of Christ and the beginnings of Christianity, as do the writers of Matthew or Acts. He agrees with all Christians that Christ died for our sins and was buried and has been raised on the third day "according to the scriptures." But his chief concern is to read the Old Testament as a whole in such a way that it shall be seen to mean not Judaism and the Law but Christ and Christianity. The most important and difficult thing that Paul had to do in his Christianizing of the Old Testament was to justify his freedom from the law and the setting aside of Israel's peculiarity and prerogative. The bearing of his use of scripture on the question before us justifies our dwelling on the matter somewhat and noting his preferences. Paul's usual way of citing Scripture is with the use of the word *γέγραπται*. It is hard to be exact in enumerating the occurrences of this form of citation; but he uses it about thirty-six times, nine for citations from the Pentateuch, sixteen from the Prophets, and ten from the Psalms and Job, leaving 1 Cor. 2:9 for the present out of account. Of the thirty-five, eleven are from Isaiah and nine from the Psalms. Adding to these, other formulas of citation and also passages evidently quoted, though without any formula, we find thirty-four from the Pentateuch, thirty-three from the Prophets and twenty-nine from the Hagiographa. Of the thirty-three, twenty-two are from Isaiah, and of the twenty-nine, twenty-four are from the Psalms. Besides actual citations there are of course other uses of Old Testament language. No list of such reminiscences or allusions can in the nature of the case be complete. For our present purpose we may take the phrases which Westcott and Hort print in uncial text in their edition, together with a few obvious additions. Including with these the citations proper, I find seventy-one references to the Pentateuch; five to the Former and ninety-eight to the Latter

Prophets; and seventy-one to the Hagiographa. Of the ninety-eight, sixty-six are to Isaiah; and of the seventy-one forty-four are to the Psalms. Three-fourths of the whole number are from the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms.

It is surely not simply an accident that Paul makes so little use of the more distinctively apocalyptic parts of the Old Testament. In the quotations proper there are none at all from Daniel. From Ezekiel there is only one, and that somewhat uncertain and of no significance. It is evident that Ezekiel did not interest Paul. From Zechariah there is one (8:16); but of the apocalyptic elements of this book Paul seems to have made no use. There is one citation from Joel (Rom. 10:13), again not eschatological. Among the allusions there is one to Daniel in that most apocalyptic of all sections of Paul's letters, the prediction of Antichrist in 2 Thess. 2:3-12 (compare 2:4 with Dan. 11:36 f.). Even those who are not doubtful of the authenticity of this book commonly agree that this apocalyptic fragment is as little "Pauline" and as evidently borrowed as any passage in his letters. It is certainly an extraordinary fact that the Book of Daniel, which has so important a place in the Gospels and Revelation, has practically no value to Paul in his search through the Old Testament for Christ. That he does not use it or reflect upon it seems to bear upon the obscure question of his knowledge of the title "Son of Man," and the special conceptions of the Messiahship and the parousia which belong to that title. Considering the frequency of Paul's references to the parousia and the closeness of the connection of this expectation in the Gospels with Daniel 7:13 and the name "Son of Man," the absence of the title in Paul's letters and his complete indifference to the Book of Daniel are surely significant. We are left then with this result, that the apocalyptic literature which was certainly within Paul's reach and had the undoubted character of canonicity he did not care for; and that he was practically content, so far as literary helps were concerned, to argue for the truth of Christianity against Judaism from the Pentateuch, and to find Christian faith and experience expressed in the language of Isaiah and the Psalms.

We have now to consider the one passage in which Paul quotes with the words "as it is written" a saying which is not found in the Old Testament, namely 1 Cor. 2:9. According to Origen the saying was found in the Secrets of Elijah the Prophet, a non-extant Jewish apocalypse. For our present purpose it is enough to make two observations on this apparent exception to the rule that Paul shows no interest in apocalyptic literature. In the first place his introduction of the quotation with the words *καθὼς γέγραπται*, with which he uniformly quotes the Old Testament, makes one suspect that he intended here to quote Isaiah 64:4 LXX. But in the second place a study of the course of thought in 1 Cor. 1-3 will make it, I think, quite certain that Paul is not speaking here of things eschatological, but of the Gospel itself, that wisdom of God which has been hidden but is now revealed to those who have received the spirit of God. The "things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him," were to

Paul not things that are still future, but the things promised of old which Christians have now received. These are things that God freely gives, but which can be known only by the spiritual; and my own conviction is clear that Paul does not intend by the wisdom which he speaks "among the perfect" to indicate an esoteric gnosis, whether about eschatological or other mysteries, additional to and distinct from Jesus Christ and him crucified, who is to us "wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption."

If Paul knew any uncanonical apocalypse it would be the Book of Enoch. His attitude toward Daniel makes us realize that he may have known Enoch very well and yet have cared nothing for it and made no use of it.

It would be interesting in this connection to compare the spirituality of Paul with that most spiritual of the apocalypses, the Parables of Enoch. The word spirit is central in this writer's religion. God is the Lord of Spirits who has filled the world with spirits. The spirit world is not to be seen by men and can be known only by revelation through one who has been translated into it. Religion consists in faith in the reality of the hidden dwelling places of the righteous, in the Lord of Spirits, in the Divine Wisdom which also dwells there, having found no dwelling place on earth, and in the Son of Man and his future coming as judge. One who has faith in this unseen world will renounce the present evil world and all its works and ways. When this other world takes the place of the present, the righteous will be changed in nature into accordance with that world and will be clothed with garments of glory, garments of life from the Lord of Spirits, which shall not grow old. They will enjoy familiar companionship with that Son of Man, in a world in which there is nothing corruptible and from which all evil shall have passed away.

Paul also knows two worlds and knows that it is the religious task of man to have his real home in the heavenly world. He also has seen in vision this heavenly realm and the heavenly man who dwells there and who is to be judge of the world. But Paul knows who this heavenly pre-existent man is. He is the exalted Jesus, but still Jesus himself, who had just lived and died in Palestine. It is in the light of his personality that Paul interprets the heavenly world. It is on this account that he never characterizes it as the apocalypses invariably do in language suggested by the actual vault of heaven, the sun and the stars. When in the third chapter of Colossians he admonishes Christians to seek the things that are above where Christ is, to set their minds on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth, he says two things about it: that the Christian's life is there already, "for ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God"; and that to seek it, to set one's mind upon it, means to put away earthly passions and unloving tempers and to put on the new man, that is the heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long-suffering, and above all, love. This then is the nature of the other world in Paul's otherworldliness. It is above and can be seen in vision, but it is within and

must be gained by moral effort; and whether above or within its name and nature is Christ. Paul makes no use even of his own apocalyptic vision (2 Cor. 12:1-5) in what he says of the world above. Why should he depend on the visions of others?

The dualism of Paul is made fundamentally different from that of the apocalypses by the fact of Christ. The doctrine of the two worlds, this world and the world to come, is often thought to be one of the distinctively apocalypitical conceptions of Paul, but its place in his scheme of thought is very different from that which it occupies in the apocalypse of Ezra. Paul can still speak of this world and of its rulers and even its god. The present world is the place or time of the power of evil. The Christian is not to be conformed to it. But he has already been delivered out of it. He is experiencing its end. Paul scarcely ever speaks of the world to come (see only Eph. 1:21 where its use is rhetorical). In fact the age to come has already dawned for the Christian. Its powers are already experienced, and its glories possessed. Already "all things are yours . . . whether things present or things to come." The dualism which is the key to Paul's thought is not expressed in the words of Ezra, "The Most High has made not one world, but two" (4 Ezra 7:50), but rather in the contrast between flesh and spirit, flesh being essentially Paul's word for human nature apart from the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit of Christ, or simply Christ (Rom. 8:1-11). The word spirit has indeed its eschatological connections; but it is unnecessary to argue here the evident and recognized fact that one of the greatest achievements of Paul was his thoroughgoing re-interpretation of the conception of spirit into accordance with the actual character of the historical Jesus (1 Cor. 12-14). Spirit remains of course to Paul the Divine Power operative in human life. But because he subjects it to the ideals and character, the mind, the love, of Christ, the supernatural becomes spiritual without losing its supernaturalness. Here as everywhere else when Paul thinks of the other world and of its forces and operations he thinks of Christ; and it is the difference which this makes that it is most essential to understand if one would know what has become of the apocalyptic elements of his inheritance in the mind of the Christian Paul. Only to this we must always add that Paul does not look away in order to see Christ, but within. The amazing fact of the Christ-likeness of the Christian is inseparably bound up with the transcendent fact of the God-likeness of Christ. And the Christ-likeness of the Christian is a fact which fills Paul with wonder and humility, but of which he is never for a moment in doubt. It is therefore possible for us, if we would know what Paul means by the other world, and therefore what the essence of his apocalyptic conception is, to look not only with him at Christ, but to look at him, and at Christ in and through him.

The real question, therefore, which we need to ask about the eschatology of Paul is, What results naturally follow and actually followed from these two great facts which are united in his great experience, the fact of

Christ and the fact of Paul's own new nature in conformity with Christ?

We notice at once that the very fact that Paul's religion is embodied in his personality distinguishes him from all the writers of apocalypses and puts him rather in the class of the great prophets, whose greatest message was themselves. Paul does not write under the name of some ancient man of God. His letters have more of himself in them than any other biblical writings, even the prophecies of Jeremiah. There is always an element of unreality even in the greatest of the apocalypses. Their assumed authorship involves a separation of the things they write from the actuality of their knowledge and experience. They are students of ancient oracles and are subject to tradition. We feel in them an incapacity to distinguish between outward forms and inner meanings, between symbols and realities. In all these things Paul is the opposite of an apocalyptic spirit.

Paul's experience was his own. The unseen world is therefore not in the same sense mysterious and external as it is when looked at by an outsider. When one has in some real sense seen God for himself his wonder and reverence are not less, but yet the God whom he knows has become in some sense his own inner and true self, and is not a God remote in space, whom one can see only in trance, or distant in time, for whose coming one has to hope and wait.

Much can be said for the value of the apocalypse, for its advance toward a cosmic and universal range and scope, and for its effectiveness in holding men's faith to the unseen reality and future coming of the rule of God in times of stress and strain; nevertheless it remains true that rational soundness and ethical strength are lacking in the apocalypses in comparison with the older prophecy. Paul's account of the newly revealed wisdom of God in 1 Cor. 1-3 is altogether in the direction of a return to inwardness and reality. Spiritual things are spiritually judged, and must therefore be known by every man for himself, quite in accordance with Jeremiah's ideal (31:31-34). The man who thus sees and judges is free and needs no outward authority. In this description of the nature of the new knowledge the nature of the things known is given. They consist of such things as can be known only in this way; and Paul is surely unmistakable in his indications as to what these things are. They are things that create humility over against all pride of opinion, and they are things that issue in the unity of mutual love, in contrast to everything that produces jealousy and strife. The height and depth of knowledge which Paul prays that Christians may apprehend is nothing but that love of Christ which passeth knowledge. Moral motives and values are dominant in the eschatology of Paul.

The coming of the Lord was always the center of the Old Testament and Jewish hope for the future. For early Christianity and for Paul the coming of the Lord was the coming of Christ. Paul takes this expectation for granted as a primary and unquestionable part of the new religion; but its place in his religion is different from its place in Matthew or in Revelation. Paul knows three comings of Christ. The first is the historical coming; and Paul sees more clearly than popular Jewish Christianity did that this has and keeps the place of first importance. It is by the life, death and

resurrection of Jesus Christ that redemption has been wrought out and accomplished. The cross is to Paul the dividing point between the old and the new. When Christ was raised by God from death and became life-giving spirit and was given the supreme title of Lord, a new creation was brought into being which can be compared only to God's calling of light out of darkness in the beginning, or to his making the first man a living soul. The gospel thus revealed and imparted is the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. The spiritual nature of the second man, the heavenly, is the beginning and source of a new and in the end all-inclusive humanity. This means that the coming of God, which was the hope of Paul's favorite Old Testament books, Isaiah and the Psalms, is in the most real sense a historical fact of the immediate past. With the resurrection of Christ the age to come has already begun. There is surely reason enough in this alone to account for the fact that Paul has little interest in the apocalypses, which have to do only with the future manifestation of a God who is now hidden or withdrawn. The difference involved in this conception of Paul is much more than a difference in time between a future and a past event. It involves a fundamental difference in kind. Externality and sensible images must essentially give place to inner experience in the thought of one to whom the fundamental intervening of God in human history took place in Christ and in his death and exaltation.

To understand the way in which Paul conceives this coming we must turn to what follows directly from it, to Paul's addition of a second coming of the Lord to his past historical coming, namely his present coming as spirit. The present experience of Christ as indwelling, and as the Divine Power that re-creates human nature, is the most characteristic and original element in his Christian thinking. The phrase "in Christ" seems to have been his own creation, and expresses his sense that Christ has become in some most real though mysterious sense the Divine element in which he lives, his own new nature, truly himself, though also not himself, the reality of the immanent God, whose presence means now the power of righteousness, and hereafter the power of eternal life. . . . "Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God." "If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above." And this being raised together with Christ means that the Christian walks in newness of life. In this language of Paul concerning the dying and rising of men with Christ there is the most striking evidence of the ease and naturalness with which the eschatological is converted in his mind into present inward and ethical experiences. One feels that the characteristic is due less to a natural mysticism in Paul than to the strength and consistency with which he carried through his picture of the actual character of the actual Jesus, and subjected all things to the test of that character. It is because it was Jesus who died and rose that his dying and rising become not only facts of the past, and not only among past facts the greatest in human history, but also inner experiences, the death of fleshly passions and of all selfishness and every divisive feeling and the beginning of a new and until then impossible kind of life.

In this quality of Paul's Christian thinking we see a further reason

why apocalypses would lose their appeal to him. The spirit of the greatest of the apocalypses is a spirit of exclusiveness and of fear and hatred toward the world. They express the self-assertion of the Jewish, or as in the Book of Revelation of the Christian, church, over against a dominant world power that threatens its destruction. Their strength is in their appeal to the martyr spirit of fidelity amid persecution, in view of the certain intervention of God for the destruction of the wicked and the elevation of the faithful to power and blessedness. But to Paul the love of God, as evident and effective in Christ, puts an end to distinction, and works in and through men toward the creation of oneness and peace.

Christ is to Paul always a person toward whom his love is intense and his loyalty and devotion unbounded. But he is at the same time a divine principle and a human ideal. Because this principle and ideal is Love, only a person can be its expression or embodiment, a person who loves and is loved. It is not only the distinctive characteristic of the Christian religion that it is embodied in an actual person, but its nature is such that it could not be contained in any other vessel than that of personality; or, we may say, Christ was such a person that the religious movement started by him must because of its nature continue to be bound up with him. To one who, like Paul, thus conceives of religion, the coming of Christ could not longer mean the coming of a certain nation to political dominance, nor the coming of Enoch's Son of Man as the divine agent for judgment. It could mean essentially nothing but the completion of the coming of the Divine Love, and that in its only conceivable embodiment in personalities.

In two passages Paul discusses the coming of the Lord in some detail. 1 Thess. 4:13-5:11 aims to allay the fear that Christians who die before Christ's coming would have no part in it. Paul's answer is that the dead and living will fare alike, and that "being ever with the Lord" is equally the goal for all. In 1 Cor. 15 the objection of the Greek mind to the idea of resurrection is discussed at length and a middle path is sought between the Jewish conception of resurrection and the Greek conception of the immortality of the soul, its separation from the body being its escape from a prison or tomb. Paul's thought is determined here of course in part by his Hebrew heritage but also and fundamentally by that which forms the ground and the contents of his hope, the destined oneness of the Christian with Christ. Death will not separate us from him, but rather his coming will mean our translation, out of death, or, if we live, out of our flesh and blood nature, into the spiritual nature of Christ. We shall bear his image as we have borne the image of Adam. Personal fellowship with Christ, and to this end likeness in nature to Christ, constitute the real meaning of the coming of the Lord to Paul. It is impossible to read his letters and still suppose that the physical descent of Christ, the shouting and sound of the trumpet of God, the bodily rapture of Christians into the spaces between earth and heaven, are original with Paul or of any essential importance to him. To be forever with the Lord is his hope, and he will not tolerate any conceptions which seem to him to put in danger

the certainty and full reality of this personal life with Christ. Death before his coming must not stand in its way; and the nature of life after death cannot be different from *his* life after death. To Paul the Greek immortality of the soul did not seem fully personal nor fitted to introduce the man himself into the presence of the heavenly Lord. Unless we also rise, and rise just as he did, to the same sort of heavenly existence, how can we hope for that association with him which is our heart's desire? "None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." "Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself." In such sentences we have both the contents and the spirit of Paul's eschatology. To be with Christ and to be wholly one with him is then the thing essential and all-inclusive.

If we look for further details which do not suggest the mere acceptance of current tradition but seem to be matters of Paul's own interest and reflection, we note especially the following. In the first place Paul looks forward to the redemption of the body as that which is still future, for those whom the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has already freed from the law of sin and of death, and who are even "not in the flesh, but in the spirit," because the spirit of God, that is the spirit of Christ, or Christ himself, dwells in them. We "who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, the redemption of our body." This is that "revealing of the sons of God" for which the whole creation waits, since it will bring to creation itself deliverance from the bondage of corruption. This magnificent picture of a transformation of the physical world into its destined fitness for spiritual life (Rom. 8:18-25) is surely the creation of Paul's own genius. It implies in striking form his conviction that the greater redemption, that of the human mind from the dominion of sin, is a thing of past fact and present experiences. The inward is essentially achieved; the outward remains for the future.

Another striking prophetic outlook of Paul concerns the completion of his own task as apostle to the Gentiles, the subjection of humanity in its completeness to Christ, and the inclusion in the end of his own brethren to whom sonship and the promises originally belonged (Rom. 9-11).

In 1 Cor. 15:20-28, we have an apocalyptic picture which depends in part on tradition but is shaped by Paul's mind, and reaches at the end a high and difficult point on which we could have wished that he had cast further light. Paul everywhere understands that Divine Love, which is the mind of Christ, is the creator of unity. He assails more vehemently than any other fault in his Christian churches every tendency toward strife, ill will, envy, rivalry, and self-assertion. Christianity means the end of all those distinctions which religion itself had magnified in the past. "There is no distinction" (Rom. 3:22). "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all

are one man in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). "Where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all." This last passage (Col. 3:11) belongs in the description of what Paul would have Christians see and become when they set their minds on the things that are above. When Paul looks forward to Christ's completion of his conquest of evil he sees a fulfillment of that supreme forecast of prophecy "The Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall the Lord be one and his name one" (Zech. 14:9). The oneness which is the goal of Paul's hope is not only created by the Divine Love, but is certainly in its nature the oneness of love. When therefore Paul says, "when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all," he cannot mean a return of the movements of history and nature into the God from whom they went forth of such a nature that an abstract and empty unity alone is left. God is the fulness of life and his oneness can be only inclusive of all that Love is and effects. At this high point of Paul's passion and thought we are certainly to see nothing inconsistent with, or different from, that other height, perhaps the greatest that he attained, where he exclaims, "I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:38 f.).

The eschatology of Paul is of such a nature, so vital, so alive with the force of his personality, so "carried alive into the heart by passion," that it is impossible to approach toward an understanding of it except by the use of his own words. Paul was of course a man of his time, and we can learn from him much in regard to the thoughts of his time as to heavenly things and beings, and future divine events. We need also the light of all contemporary literature, including the apocalyptic, in order to understand his language and the forms of his thought. But Paul was a great personality and had a great experience; and the new feelings and thoughts which this experience called forth in him are more significant than the forms in which they struggled for expression. It is possible that a development can be traced in his letters from more outward to more spiritual forms of hope; but the underlying principles of his religion of hope remain the same, and what is more certain and more important than a development of his ideas is the fact that always and everywhere the bearing and natural tendency and effect of his thought and feeling are toward the spiritual. The Christian both is and is to be like Christ. And that which we hope for we already possess, and so know, even though only in part, yet with the certainty of actual experience. But this Christ-likeness now and hereafter is both a gift from God, a divine creation, and also equally a moral ideal and an achievement.

PAUL AND THE DOCTRINE OF RECOMPENSE

Floyd V. Filson

IT IS OF the utmost importance to determine as far as possible what Saul the Pharisee thought about the place of the recompense principle in God's dealings with men. Such a background would enable us to recognize what was new and what was old in his Christian theology, and what shifting of emphasis took place in his new correlation of the elements of his thinking. Yet it must be admitted that, important as is the attempt, it can never be fully successful. We possess no direct evidence of Paul's pre-Christian thinking along this line. But we can draw conclusions from contemporary Jewish thought. We can also draw inferences from the New Testament; and in particular we can study Paul's letters to learn what they reveal of his preconversion theology, colored perhaps by his Christian thinking. The effort will be highly instructive and, in part, successful, but it will leave an element of uncertainty.

The central fact, however, cannot be questioned. Human accountability and divine recompense were axiomatic truths in the day and environment in which Saul was trained and lived. This principle of God's dealing with men gained in prestige during the Greek and Roman periods until it became of central importance in Jewish thinking. As a Pharisee (Phil. 3:5-6), in particular, Saul was definitely committed to it.

... Saul was an advanced Pharisee (Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:5) and jealously defended his position. Therefore we may be sure that his dominant thought of recompense was, not "practical" or "utilitarian" nor "popular" and "this-worldly," but rather centered around the great last judgment with its rewards and punishments. This was a distinctive Pharisaic doctrine in contrast with the Sadducee position, which denied a future life with recompense according to one's life record; and just because it was a point under dispute, it would be so much the more emphatically asserted by the outstanding young Pharisee. No doubt he held that, even in this life to some extent, rewards and punishments are meted out by God, but only at the last day will the full and just recompense due to each individual be received. This view rested on the unshakeable conviction of the perfect righteousness of God, who could be relied on to deal justly with each person and finally to give each one what he deserved.

In preparation for this final reckoning Saul had to keep the law. God had made a covenant with his people and had given them the law. The blessings attaching to this covenant relation were dependent upon observance of

From *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense*, Leipzig, 1931, pp. 2-19. Reprinted by permission of the author.

the law in all departments of one's life. And to a Pharisee the tradition (cf. Gal. 1:14) which had grown up around this law was binding. If he kept the law with its interpretative tradition, he could expect reward; if he failed to do so, punishment awaited him.

Two corollaries of this view of law and life should be clearly noted. In the first place, emphasis on divine retribution tends to center attention on the individual rather than on the fortunes of Israel as a whole. "Individualism steadily makes its way." In the second place, such an attitude plainly implies the freedom and ability of man to keep the law and tradition. As a matter of fact, we have evidence that such freedom was openly asserted. Josephus three times declares that the Pharisees were careful to maintain the freedom of the human will, even if they did contend at the same time that God's providence must also be fully recognized. A summary statement of this viewpoint is that of Akiba: "All is foreseen, and free will is given, and the world is judged by goodness; and all is according to the amount of work." The Pharisee felt himself obligated to observe faithfully the law and its interpretative tradition and was convinced that the human freedom which this responsibility implied was unquestionably his. His use of this freedom, his record of law observance, would determine the judgment of God upon him.

Without question such a vigorous teaching possessed great truth. Its worth and contribution to mankind must not be minimized. It has always been a fact that the great majority of men have throughout life needed external rules and guidance for their moral and religious life, and every individual needs such guidance at least until he has reached an advanced stage of spiritual maturity. Perhaps no one entirely outgrows this need. Moreover, it is possible even for such advanced persons to couple inner zeal and a sense of freedom with outward observance of a legal code and so to preserve the essence of the spiritual life—its inwardness. The method, therefore, of shaping life by an external code has practical considerations in its favor, and needs not with absolute necessity prevent genuine spiritual living. Furthermore, this Pharisaic attitude was absolutely right in its insistence on the inseparable connection between morality and religion. This connection enriched morality and gave it a firm basis by linking it firmly to religion. On the other hand, the emphasis on accountability and judgment protected religion from indifference to morality. "There could not be a morality apart from religion, or a religion apart from morality." Judaism bequeathed moral fiber to Christianity.

Nevertheless such a conception of one's relation to God involves certain dangers. In the first place, it is possible to lose the vital inwardness of religion in a legalized kind of life. The spiritual and moral life is apt to be ruled by external standards instead of to be guided by vital inner motives. External and mechanical considerations can dominate and blight spontaneous religious feeling and expression.

This attitude leads to a second weakness. When life becomes legalized, it loses balance and true earnestness. One's duty is to keep the law. The deeper perception of values is blunted, and various precepts having to do

with duties widely varying in nature and importance tend to become equally important. What one does is not so important as the fact that one does it because it is commanded.

Connected with this attempt to do everything commanded is the effort to state one's duty for the various contingencies of life. The unity of the moral life is lost in casuistry. . . .

Loss of peace and calm is another tendency of this life under the law. One must constantly strive to keep the balance of good works in one's favor. The thought of God as judge and recompenser leads to a feeling of fear as the prevailing attitude toward him. There are, of course, passages in the literature of Judaism which show that isolated individuals escaped somewhat from the prevalent impulse to regard one's life mainly as a means of earning a reward. Antigonus of Socho counseled: Do not be like the servants who serve their masters for the reward, but be like those who serve without thought of reward. Another viewpoint emphasized doing good for the sake of sanctifying the divine name. Such motivation of action is, however, rare. The thought of recompense, the desire for reward, predominates, and this militates against tranquil fellowship with God. . . .

But how do we know Saul was typical in these respects? Obviously we cannot assume that he was like the others of his sect in all points, for he was a unique personality. But his attitude toward his past life and toward the Judaism and Jewish Christianity of his apostolic days indicates that he had been an orthodox Pharisee, and that he had succumbed to the dangers mentioned, at least to some extent. He constantly insisted that the law and faith were mutually exclusive ways of life (Gal. 2:15 ff.; 3:2, 23ff.; 5:4 ff.; Rom. 4:4-5, 14); because the law—the legal system—had been held by him as an external system which was fatal to the inwardness of religion (cf. Gal. 2:21; 3:23; 4:9, 25). In his great triumphant realization that love is the one great command (Gal. 5:14; Rom. 13:9) it is reasonable to trace a sense of liberation from the former conception that many commandments of equal weight, casuistically interpreted, are given to man to fulfill. And although Romans 7 is difficult to interpret, the use of the first person in describing, even if from a Christian standpoint, a past struggle is evidence that Saul, with all his correct legal conformity (Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:6), was yet unable to attain deep and satisfying religious peace.

The Pharisee Saul was most certainly an adherent of the view that God recompenses men—to some extent now, but fully at the great judgment—on the basis of their conformity to his law. There is ample reason to believe that Saul held this view in a legalistic, superficial, casuistical form, and that with all good intentions and effort he could not escape a suppressed, smoldering sense of lack and inadequacy.

It would, however, be decidedly misleading to present the above sketch as a complete description of Saul's views. Too often it has not been realized that other factors played a part in his thinking, making of his Pharisaic thinking a complex affair and providing in various ways a basis for his later Christian ideas. It is necessary to note the most important of these other factors which conditioned and limited the scope of the recompense prin-

ciple. Otherwise our picture of Saul would be one-sided and misleading.

First of all, it cannot be doubted that Saul was a firm believer in the doctrine of God's providence. The Pharisees held fast to the freedom of the human will and to the resulting human accountability, as a result of which the divine recompense was possible. Nevertheless at the same time they ascribed all things to the working of God's providence. This is the meaning of the passages in Josephus which speak of the Pharisaic belief in *εἰμαρμένη*. Josephus is conforming the Jewish teachings to Greek terminology; what he means by *εἰμαρμένη* is simply *πρόνοια*—providence. This belief of the Pharisees is also confirmed by such passages as Aboth III, 19. When Paul wrote of the divine providence and of God's predestination (Rom. 8:28-30; 9; Eph. 1:11; 3:11), he was introducing a thought group which he had always held. This is further verified by the apocalyptic conviction that all things were predetermined to the very day and hour, and that the destiny of men was fully determined by God. Paul, who obviously was acquainted with the apocalyptic tradition and shared the apocalyptic viewpoint, was more or less under the influence of the idea that things happened as God determined, so that men's lives and acts were small parts of a great unalterable plan (cf. Gal. 4:4). Thus as a Pharisee and as an apocalypticist Saul was committed to the belief in God's all-determining providence.

Closely connected with this belief in God's providence and predetermination was the conviction Saul had that he belonged to God's chosen people and therefore was by this fact in line for spiritual privileges and blessings. Those who had the covenant, circumcision, the cult, the law, the merits of the pious, the opportunity for supererogatory good works and denials, and so forth, felt a definite superiority; they were not *ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἀμαρτωλοί* (Gal. 2:15). By the temple and its ceremonial they were, not only bound together in a divinely blessed fellowship, but also marked off from other nations. The rich promises of God to his special people gave them great confidence. Every Jew paid the half-shekel temple tax and so participated in the benefits of the offerings made by the priests. It is absolutely certain that Saul was strongly influenced by all these ideas. They continued to play a part even in his later Christian thinking (Gal. 1:14; II Cor. 11:22; Rom. 2:1 ff., 17 ff.; 3:1-2; 9:4-5; Phil. 3:5-6). Obviously as a Pharisee he had not been ruled by the recompense principle alone, but also by a feeling that God's plan was favorable to him, and that he as a member of the chosen people might expect advantages now and also hereafter. This conviction was so deeply rooted that he never surrendered it but wrestled earnestly to justify to his Christian conscience the rejection of the gospel by Israel in view of the fact that they were God's chosen people; only this lifelong conviction that they were God's chosen people explains the presence of Romans 9-11 in a letter written in his later Christian days.

As a Pharisee, however, a refined form of this consciousness of privilege would be held by Saul. Within the chosen people there were differences. The Pharisees held that they were the true representatives of Israel; to them really belonged the privileges of the covenant, for they were true in thought

and life to God's compact with his people. Pride of sect was added to pride of nation. Undoubtedly the thought that the Pharisees kept the law and therefore were more worthy and deserving than the others operated here, and so the recompense principle played its part. But it was also true that adherence to this proper sect of the chosen people was in itself considered advantageous and beneficial.

... There is a clear indication in Romans 9:5; 11:16, 28; 15:8 that Paul in his pre-Christian days had shared this viewpoint, for the only reason such ideas occur in his Christian writings is that he had held them previously as a Jew and Pharisee.

It is clear already that in the mind of Saul the recompense principle did not stand alone in his thought about God's dealings with men. The divine providence, the advantage of belonging not simply to the chosen people but especially to the select inner circle of this favored nation, and the merits of the fathers were elements in his thinking. And these elements were on the whole of a reassuring character. Still other considerations, however, are to be mentioned. The ugly fact of sin was not to be denied, and it greatly influenced Pharisaic theology. Sin burdened the individual who looked towards the judgment with a quickened sense of accountability. Moreover, it was not only his own wrongdoing. Since the fall of Adam the race had labored under a terrible handicap. In marked contrast to the beneficial inheritance of the merits of the fathers was this crushing ancestral influence originating with Adam. The implanted "evil impulse" in man was enslaved by the hereditary curse from Adam's fall, until the burden sometimes seemed too great to bear. . . . The effect of Adam's fall is a fixed point in the teaching of IV Ezra and II Baruch. Yet this did not serve as an excuse for men's wrongdoing; they still had a freedom and a responsibility which prevented self-defense and drove the conscientious toward desperation. The need of forgiveness was felt, and the desire for God's grace was strong. The conviction—amply justified by numerous passages in the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings—that God was gracious and forgiving could not be completely eliminated. Confessions of guilt, pleas for mercy, expressions of trust in grace, are frequently found in Judaism of the New Testament period. For God's people, at least, this grace was available.

How far Saul shared this attitude is really an insoluble question. It was not a distinctively Christian idea, but was brought over into Christianity by Paul from Judaism. Therefore he knew, and to some extent must have shared, the ideas of this sort which were present. The irritable fierceness with which he persecuted the early Christians seems to point to an undertone of discontent in his own life. Such passages as Romans 7 are to be utilized with caution, but it is entirely reasonable to find in this description of the moral helplessness of the unbeliever some basis of suppressed uncertainty and dissatisfaction in the pre-Christian experience of the apostle. There is nothing to indicate that Saul was heavily burdened with consciousness of sin, but there are hints that an undertone of failure was not entirely lacking in his life. He was an outstanding religious man in his generation

(Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:5-6). But something of uneasiness, perhaps not felt in full consciousness, was there.

The main section of the investigation is now to be undertaken. Using as a basis the ten letters of Paul accepted as genuine, the attempt must be made to determine the place which the recompense principle occupied in the life and thinking of the Christian apostle Paul. It is necessary to begin with the question as to the effect of the conversion experience on the previous attitude of Paul. Did it imply, or in its influence lead to, a surrender of the principle which previously had been central?

There are many problems, some no doubt insoluble, connected with the Damascus experience of Paul. The present study is concerned only with its possible effect on the idea that God rewards or punishes men according to their record. It is axiomatic that after his conversion Paul had a new idea of the favor of God toward himself and other Christians. His letters reveal a sense of God's grace to him, not only at conversion (Rom. 1:5), but also throughout his later life (I Cor. 15:10; II Cor. 12:9). He regards the divine favor as constantly available for all his converts as well as for himself (cf. I Thess. 1:1; 5:28, and all letter openings and endings). The grace shown in making conversion possible guarantees continuing grace and blessing (Rom. 8:32). Paul is an apostle of the grace of God in Christ; so much is certain. One cannot say that after Paul's conversion the principle of recompense is central and dominant as it was previously. Nor can one say that after the great initial act of grace in receiving men into Christian standing before himself, God then puts men back into a position where for the future the recompense principle rules with full sway. God's grace so wonderfully experienced at the beginning of the Christian life continues to accompany and bless the believer. He no longer earns his standing before God; he receives it as a gift which he does not deserve; and its continuance rests upon the continuance of divine favor. In his conversion, and henceforth, it was revealed to Paul that God is essentially, centrally, and eternally gracious.

It might appear after superficial consideration that the recompense principle is thereby not merely removed from the center of the picture, but it can no longer find a place as an element of the whole. One look at the letters of Paul, however, is sufficient to show that statements of recompense as still operative in the world are constantly recurring. It seems, then, that Paul's conversion experience of the risen Christ led to a reorganization of his ideas to the extent that God's grace became central instead of God's recompensing activity, but this was merely a shifting of emphasis and not an abandonment of the recompense principle. Impressed by this fact, we are led to study the effect of the conversion experience more carefully, and we note that in at least three respects we can confirm and explain the persistence of the recompense idea in the letters of the apostle who was converted and blessed by the grace of God.

In the first place, not all men are saved: only those who believe appropriate for themselves the grace of God. There is nothing in the conversion

of Paul to point to an escape for those who refuse the divine offer. Deserving condemnation, as Paul knows they do, and refusing to believe and so be helped to a safe position, there is nothing to expect for them but God's wrath (I Thess. 1:10; II Thess. 1:8-9; 2:12; Rom. 1:18, 32; 2:8; etc.). For unbelievers the recompense principle still operates—to their ruin. It will be seen later that there is no surrender of this attitude because of any easy universalism that saves all without condition; the passages suggesting such a hypothesis demand another explanation (Rom. 5:18; 11:26, 32; I Cor. 15:22). Salvation is not universal; retribution strikes unbelievers with full force; and therefore, with respect to them at least, Paul's conversion signifies no surrender of the recompense principle.

But a second consideration indicates that even in connection with those who are saved, there is no complete surrender of the recompense principle as a result of Paul's conversion experience. Paul does not believe that believers are accepted into fellowship with God on the simple ground of free forgiveness. On the contrary, the sinful men who have been converted were bought with a price (I Cor. 6:20; 7:23). Their salvation was possible only through the death of Christ.

From one aspect this death is thought of as a substitutionary suffering by Christ of the penalty due men for their sins (Gal. 3:13; I Cor. 15:3; II Cor. 5:14-15, 21; Rom. 3:25-26; 5:8). By a principle current in Paul's day—that it was possible for a man's penalty to be borne by another—Jesus had accepted the punishment which according to the recompense principle men deserved, and only on this basis did Paul and his fellow Christians enter into the Christian life. The recompense principle struck Jesus instead of those he came to redeem.

In this connection the idea of the merits of the fathers is seen to have played a preparatory role. Something of meditation, of privilege and position, of benefit was believed to be obtainable through them. While the influence of this viewpoint never was completely lost on Paul (Rom. 9:5; 11:28; 15:8), nevertheless Jesus moved into the place which the idea of the merits of the fathers had occupied. This of course did not exhaust the significance of Jesus, or even of his death, for Paul, but it is an instructive point of contact with Pharisaic viewpoints.

The main point for our study, however, is that the forgiveness received by Paul and others who were converted was not a mere overlooking and free cancellation of their guilt; but it was possible only by a special application of the recompense principle, which spent its force on Jesus, the guiltless, instead of on those whose guilt really made them liable to punishment. Paul's conversion experience, in so far as it brought a feeling of being forgiven, did this without revocation of the recompense principle.

In yet a third respect it can be seen that the conversion of Paul involved no surrender of this recompense principle. As has been pointed out by Wernle, Paul never states that the benefits of the death of Christ avail for sins committed after baptism. His death enables the sinner who repents and believes to enter into full fellowship with God and to have peace (Rom. 5:1-2); it makes possible a complete forgiveness for past sins. But there

are no statements that only daily forgiveness is available, or that the death of Christ is adequate to take care of all sins committed by the Christian. Paul insists that the standard for the Christian is a perfectly holy and blameless life (I Thess. 3:13; 5:23; I Cor. 1:8). He demands that Christians possess, not merely an "imputed righteousness," but also a "real righteousness," so that daily forgiveness will not be needed. Because sin has no place in the Christian life, there is no need to make provision for its daily remission.

We do not here forget what has already been stated—that God's grace accompanies the believer and sustains him throughout all his life. The Christian has the Spirit as his guide and intercessor (Rom. 8:14, 26). He has the Risen Christ as his indwelling life (Gal. 2:19-20) and his effective intercessor (Rom. 8:34—cf. 5:10). He is compassed about by grace, and in such passages as Romans 8:26, 34 one might see a veiled or unconscious indication that Paul felt there was mercy available, not only for human weakness, but also for human wrongdoing. Whether that is so or not, Paul does assume in practice that converts who have sinned have not forfeited their Christian position entirely, even if they have seriously endangered it (Gal. 6:1; I Cor. 5:1 ff.). Such wrongdoing is abnormal and entirely out of place in the Christian life; but if it is resolutely and promptly renounced, it ceases to blight the religious and moral life. Somehow, without making his position clear, Paul lets us feel that there is a way for these sins to be cared for, so that fellowship with a Holy God is not completely destroyed by such occasional and abnormal appearances of sin. But what is really startling and noteworthy for our study is the fact that not once does Paul clearly say that a Christian can obtain forgiveness for sins; not once does he explicitly apply the death of Christ to a Christian's postbaptismal sins, while he does explicitly and repeatedly emphasize human responsibility and accountability for all that one does during his Christian life. In this limitation of the benefits of Christ's death, it becomes plain that the conversion experience does not involve a surrender of the recompense principle in the life of the Christian.

The foregoing examination of the effect of Paul's conversion upon the recompense principle has shown that while a new and central emphasis upon the grace of God resulted, nevertheless the recompense principle was retained and even vindicated. Although it was moved from the central position it had occupied for the Pharisee Saul, it was still conceived as operating with full force upon the unbelieving; it was respected in the substitutionary atonement of Christ which made possible forgiveness for believers; and it was retained in operation on the Christian, who was conceived as still accountable for his Christian life.

There is nothing surprising in this conclusion. Paul came from Judaism, where the recompense principle was central. He became a member of a Church whose Founder and members believed firmly in that principle. Not only did John the Baptist emphasize the imminence of judgment, but Jesus also announced a judgment that would apply to all and would be decided according to deeds. The situation is well stated by Morgan: "While Jesus nowhere contemplates a dispensation in which the principle of recom-

pense has lost its validity, He is far indeed from treating that principle as the ultimate and inviolable rule of God's action." The early Church continued to sound the note of recompense. It expected Jesus to return as judge (Acts 10:42). This expectation was shared by all Christians. Judaism and Christianity were in essential agreement on this matter of recompense and differed chiefly in the place ascribed to Jesus by Christians. Since this is so, we should not expect Paul's conversion to lead him to lose faith in the recompense principle. It was rather inevitable that he should retain it.

THE CENTRAL PLACE OF MORALITY IN THE LIFE AND THOUGHT OF PAUL

Morton S. Enslin

BY FAITH IN CHRIST and the power of his resurrection the Christian came into immediate fellowship with his Lord. He was baptized into his death and, thus leaving behind his old sinful nature, was raised into newness of life. He had died to the flesh, characterized and dominated by all its lusts, and henceforth lived to the spirit. Thus he actually became a new man in Christ Jesus. He had been consecrated, set apart, by baptism, but this rite, though important, did not have the same magical effectiveness as did the similar initiatory rites of the other cults. In them it was sufficient. By this initiation into the cult the devotee learned "the secret" by the aid of "the things done and the things said;" accordingly, salvation was unconditionally assured him. The Christian rite was to a measure similar in that it too plunged the initiate into mystic union with the risen Lord, by the impartation of whose spirit a new life began, yet that was not all. His life must conform to his new exalted status of being "in Christ" (ἐν Χριστῷ) *i.e.*, mystically and intimately united with Christ. By this union he was assured a place in the eternal destiny of the world, in the new age soon to be ushered in. Death, should that come before the dawn of the new age, would have no effect save that of bringing the Christian into an even closer union freed from any danger of relapse into sin.

But this glorious destiny was only for those who actually lived "in Christ." To be sure, good works as such, keeping of the law and the like, could not grant this boon; it must come as the free gift of God to be appropriated by the Christian's faith, yet this faith was by no means a mere intellectual assent. As Matthew Arnold neatly turned it:

The surpassing religious grandeur of Paul's conception of faith is that it seizes a real salutary emotional force of incalculable magnitude, and reinforces moral effort with it.

It was actually a new life where the flesh was in subjection to the spirit and brought forth fruits evidencing the fact that the man was righteous before God. For Paul, morality, far from being of no consequence as we have seen it was for the other mysteries, was directly resultant from his doctrine of salvation through faith. The Christian was impelled toward a certain kind of life by virtue of his union with his Lord. If he was really ἅγιος—consecrated, separate, set apart to God—to Paul's mind he must

From *The Ethics of Paul*, New York, 1930, pp. 63-78. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Harper & Brothers.

inevitably show it; if he was really yoked to Christ, he must live in a fitting way. The exalted position he held as actually "in his Lord," and with his Lord dwelling in him, could not fail to bring him to the full stature of the perfect man. As a recent writer [G. F. Moore] has expressed it:

... In Christianity a character conformed to God's own is the consequence of the grace of God in Jesus Christ, through the Holy Spirit. The possession of such a character is therefore the criterion of the genuineness of man's faith and the reality of his union with Christ.

This was the gospel which he had been called to preach. It was at once his duty and his joy to make it known to all men. He was not ashamed of it, for it was the power of God to salvation to all who accepted it. His task was to strive in every possible way to offer this gospel to men that they could accept it; that he might present all men faultless in Christ Jesus; that at the great day of judgment, when all men stood before the judgment bar, it might be not a day of wrath, but a day of salvation. To attain this he would go to all extremes. Though free through the power of Christ's death, he gladly made himself a slave to all that he might win all for Christ. Though a free man, he rejoiced that he was privileged to be Christ's slave in this glorious task. Nothing else in life counted; the most prized possessions of life—high birth, a noble ancestry, a rich heritage—of which he had been proud, he now gladly reckoned as less than nothing. In comparison with this one great hope of being found in Christ, and through a life of participation in Christ's sufferings of attaining to the resurrection of his Lord, they were but refuse and offscouring.

This was the heritage in store for every Christian. The prize, beside which all else was worthless, was the call to this glorious fellowship which came from God through Christ Jesus. The way might be rough; the Christian life which must be resolutely achieved might be accompanied by suffering; temptations would come—but never beyond their strength; false teachers would strive to deceive; the lusts of the flesh would menace; but all these must be crushed. The struggle would be desperately hard, but the goal would be worth it. Nor must they wait too long. Even then the day was at hand. For those who failed it would be a day of wrath and condemnation; but to those who were in Christ, and whose lives proved it, it would be a day of praise and honor, and, better than that, of eternal life in their Lord. Thus the first demand upon the Christian was, as an individual, to make his life conform to that of his Lord; to cut himself free resolutely from all that would hinder and impede. Its character was purity, separateness; its motive, the hope of eternal salvation.

To us today Paul's emphasis on morality and his insistence that actual union with Christ must result in a changed life seem perfectly normal. Yet it must never be overlooked that that would not have been the consensus of opinion in his own day. . . . The Oriental mystery cults made no such demands on their devotees; correctness of ritual, not purity of life, was the essential requirement. Moreover, religion and ethics in the

ancient world were not so nearly identified as we are wont to make them today.

This makes Paul's insistence on the changed life which bears fruits of the spirit the more noteworthy, for one might expect from a saying like, "But if it is by grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace," where faith and works are set in contrast, that Paul would have entirely disregarded conduct and would have disagreed utterly with James. Here Paul and James, however, are on entirely different ground. It is an error to feel that one has a broader view than the other, for they are not discussing the same matter. James is arguing that both faith and works are necessary; Paul, on the contrary, although setting fully as high an ethical standard, denies that salvation comes through works, but insists that the works evidence the fact that the individual has actually entered into union with Christ. Paul would not have quarreled with James' contentions about morality or the need of works, although he would probably have preferred to call the latter "fruits of the spirit." The important fact, too often overlooked, is that what Paul stigmatized "works of the law" are by no means the same as the works which James demands, while the sort of faith which James calls "dead" would never have been classed as faith at all by Paul.

The significant point for us is not to strive to defend Paul's logic—always a difficult undertaking—but to recognize how fundamental to all his thinking was the emphasis on moral probity. Well did he realize the danger of his emphasis on freedom from law. The *pneumatikoi* at Corinth were evidencing the results that might well come from such a teaching when detached from moral requirements. Accordingly, again and again he asserts that such conduct clearly revealed the fact that the faith professed is not in Christ, but in the power of wickedness, and warns that all men regardless of baptism must stand before the judgment bar.

The question arises why Paul laid the stress he did on moral conduct. There is a tendency today to see a Stoic influence at work in the apostle. There is no question but what the Stoic moral requirements were strict in Paul's time, and that he would have approved them, but I see no reason for assuming influence where the evidence is completely lacking. Paul's heritage from Judaism and his view of Jesus are sufficient to explain his attitude.

In Judaism . . . religion and morals were essentially identified, and the highest of standards for conduct set. God had revealed his will in requirements of conduct as in everything else. Israel was to follow it. Here an important point is to be noticed. The fundamental requirement was conformity to God. "Be ye holy, for I am holy." Jehovah was a God of unstained character; no impure myths or legends told of his amours. He was a God of righteousness and of holiness; and holiness—at least in the days of Judaism—signified moral purity. Accordingly, the people must reflect this character in their lives.

Paul held this view of God. This moral outlook on life was bred in the bone. So when he came to his view of the mystical union of the believer

with Christ—which actually lay at the bottom of all his thinking—it was but natural that the same strict moral requirements should be made. Christ was no unmoral or immoral deity, as were the lords in some of the other cults. None of the amours or impure stories that were told of all the pagan deities were told of him. His character was of the same spotless purity as was that of Jehovah. As a result requirements of character, which were neglected or unnoticed by the ministrants of the Oriental mystery cults, were of prime importance to Paul. Such was the Lord to whom Christians were most intimately united, who dwelt in them, and to whom they were set apart from all that would defile. Anything that would tend to sully Christ, to join him to a harlot, to defile the body which was his holy temple, was an abomination and to be shunned resolutely.

The historian is always subject to the danger of attempting to find the complete explanation of a man in his environment and heredity, and thus to neglect the personal element. In none is this more unfortunate than in Paul. He was a debtor both to Jew and to Greek, but that does not explain him. His own personality and individual contribution cannot be neglected. This is particularly true in his moral teachings. Here Paul was reflecting his own outlook on life. He could well admonish his churches to become imitators of him. His standards were of the highest. He has often been charged with being a casuist and opportunist, but the criticism neglects the essential fact that Paul's opportunism was never for his own advantage. He might be all things to all people, but his purpose was to win them for God.

Phil. 1:15-18 is instructive. Apparently some Christians who were jealous of Paul had been striving to undermine his influence at Philippi and had made false charges against him, yet Paul refuses to yield to any personal animosity, but rather rejoices in so far as they preach Christ, in spite of their attack on him. This is one of the brightest spots in Paul's writings. No bidding for flattery here. This reveals the sincerity and disinterested nature of the apostle's work. Even in the words, "I would that they that unsettle you would even go beyond circumcision (*ἀποκόψονται*)," which Sanday characterized as "one of the very few flaws in a truly noble and generous character" it is not personal animosity that leads the apostle to speak in such bitterness. His opponents are poaching on his preserves, but the terrible thing to Paul is that, owing to their selfishness and desire for personal gain, they are striving to nullify Christ's death and to plunge the Galatian Christians back into hopeless servitude to the law of sin and death. Paul's words are bitter, but the bitterness does not come from personal grudge. Or again in the delightful little letter to Philemon, which seems genuine if any of the letters are to be attributed to Paul, once more he shows his ethical soundness. Gladly would he have kept Onesimus to help him, yet he sent him back to make restitution.

In the course of the more detailed examination of Paul's particular precepts and admonitions we shall have occasion to consider his motives and arguments in fuller detail; but it has seemed wise in this discussion of his emphasis on morality and high standards of life, in an age when many

teachers were completely silent on the subject, to stress the fact that, while his Jewish heritage explains why a high morality *might have been natural* to him, as a matter of fact it *was*, and that it seemed to him, far from constituting any artificial or unreasonable service—what gentleman does?—to be the normal result of a life lived in Christ.

But Paul was a practical man, and he realized well that this was a practical world. Though the Christian was united with his Lord, he was also in the closest contact with his fellows. They had had similar experiences; they were joined in the same vital union—or should be—with their risen Lord; their tasks were much the same. Accordingly, they should live in the most perfect harmony, and by a mutual give-and-take strengthen each other in their glorious faith. Paul loves to emphasize the “solidarity” of man, the joint interest which binding humanity together makes the brother’s interest truly one’s own.

Here Paul made his most lasting contribution. The Stoics had urged a noble life, a resolute uprooting of all passions and appetites, a purging of the life from all excesses and lusts of the flesh, a daily self-examination and gradual improvement. But they failed to provide a goal attractive to the many. Comparatively few cared to accept the rigorous self-discipline with no goal save doing it because it was right. Weariness in well-doing was the great obstacle. There was no future reward held out to them, nor was there the challenging social call to do it for the sake of one’s fellow citizen.

Paul met both these longings. Like the mystery cults, Christianity promised future life where all transient sufferings and sorrows would be forgotten in the glorious estate reserved for them. And Christianity was free from the extravagance and obscenities that so often marred the other mysteries and had to be explained or allegorized away. But in addition to this goal or reward which served as a tremendous motive Paul gave Christianity a lasting solidarity by his emphasis on their obligation one to the other. Not only was a man to strive to walk worthily of the inheritance that was to be his, and by his purity of life to show he was a “new man,” but he was to live and act in such a way that his brethren might also attain. They were a little band of people, sojourners in a foreign land; heaven was their home. They were exposed to dangers from both Jew and heathen. False brethren were striving to spy out their freedom, to bring them again into captivity to sin. They must offer an unbroken front to the enemy.

Nor was this the only reason for their union. Aside from the danger from without that united them, the Christians were to live together as brethren; their faith was in a common Lord—one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Dissension and discord among themselves was a sin against Christ, for by the particular nature of their bond with him they were linked together. As Christ dwelt in them, they together actually formed his body, various members surely, but yet together actually making up the body. Lack of harmony, factiousness, and the like would disrupt Christ’s body; so the sin of the one was against the many. Actually this consciousness of the corporate life, of the unity of believers, was the most effective

motive that Paul could have urged upon his fellow Christians for achieving the true *koinonia*.

Love and forbearance were the great social virtues. Love that united all in the common bond, that saw in his neighbor's good his own—this was the social virtue *par excellence*. It stood the fulfillment of all law. But complementing it was forbearance. If the Christian groups were to be in harmony and in peace—and God had called them to peace—they must show forbearance each to the other. As each had received special gifts from God, he was to use them, but was to remember that the really great gifts were those that ministered to the edification of all. All had not reached the same stage of moral maturity. Those who were strong must never misuse their freedom; they were to bear the burdens of the weak, lest the weaker brother perish—a brother for whose sake Christ had died. On the contrary, it is to be observed that the weaker brother is not to relapse into self-complacency on account of his scruples and to assume a self-righteous judgment toward those who have more common sense. "Let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him." As love was the all-enduring virtue and forbearance was its corollary, service was the great duty. Each man was to help the other; service was the law of life. They had been called to freedom—not, however, to a freedom that was license, but where love found its expression in service.

In such a group arrogance and pride would be out of place. They were not their own, but were bought with a price. Each was to walk preferring his neighbor to himself and in obedience to those in spiritual authority over them. Thus the purity and uprightness, the strictness and temperance of life that was demanded of the individual Christian as such from his relation to Christ flowered out into the social virtues and duties, due to the fact that all were members one of another, making up the body of which Christ was the head.

But though the Christians were thus united through their Lord one to another, they were living in a hostile world. Accordingly, questions arose as to what should be the relation of the individual Christian and of the Christian fellowship with the world. Paul's teaching was explicit. To the government and those in authority over them they were to be in the most lawful obedience, for the powers that be were ordained of God. To the members of the world, discreet; all fellowship with them was not forbidden, indeed could not be. Christians lived in the world, although they were not of the world. They were to be ever conscious, however, of the difference between themselves and those about. If the Christian was the slave of a heathen master, he was to serve him in the most perfect fidelity. If a Christian was married to an "unbeliever," the Christian was not to seek to break the alliance unless the unbeliever so desired. But he was not to make new alliances of this sort. So far as possible he was to remain unfettered. The attitude seems to be expressed by the warning: Be discreet, avoiding everything that would subject the Christian fellowship to attack or defense. Various questions presented themselves and received special attention, as

we shall see, yet this seems to have been the general principle underlying the apostle's advice.

Thus we see Paul had no formal system of ethics as such, no text book for Christian conduct though the *Haustafeln* in the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians would seem to be a step toward filling that need. Ethics and religion for him, as for any other Jew, could never be dissociated. The Christian ethic was the living in a manner worthy of the high calling to which the Christian had been called. It embraced the whole of life and all the relationships of life. While occasional questions would arise as to the proper course to be followed with the fellow Christian and with the group as such or with "unbelievers," yet the real answer was implicit in the Christian's proper conduct of life as such. Accordingly, all these distinctions which to a degree are necessary for a modern consideration are not completely happy, and must never be regarded as hard and fast. All the duties and virtues, the responsibilities and privileges, were included in the task the Christian had of living in a way worthy of his calling, and were inspired by the longing to attain to his promised reward.

In conclusion, throughout his epistles the ethical note is prominent. The theological or doctrinal discussions may engage him for the moment, yet he ever turns back as Gardner acutely observes "with obvious relief . . . to his ethical exhortation." These exhortations for the most part were called forth to meet the specific needs of the Christians to whom he ministered, and thus were intensely practical and timely in their nature and a far step from the ordered sequence of a Greek moralist like Aristotle. Yet they were not the impromptu words of an opportunist, but were the expression of the deep-seated principles governing his life—of the facts and implicates of union with Christ, and their corollary, the union of fellow believers in Christ. We might almost say this sense of *koinonia* produced his ethics, or at least gave to it its distinctive form.

[AN ETHICAL ANARCHIST]

Francis C. Burkitt

WE SEE THE stage gradually prepared for the career of Paul, the converted Pharisee. He had been an opponent of Stephen, was "consenting to his death," and was on an errand of persecution when, as he phrases it, "God revealed His Son in me!" Thanks to his Letters we can get to know the mind of Paul very well: what we do not know in detail are the opinions of Saul of Tarsus. He was a Pharisee, one who observed the Law strictly. He had studied under Gamaliel; but, as C. G. Montefiore has reminded us, we do not know what proficiency he acquired in the specifically Rabbinic lore—for instance, I do not think he has anywhere quoted or adapted any known utterance of Gamaliel. Mr. Montefiore's *caveat* is timely, for Christians have been too apt to regard St. Paul as having attained the very pinnacle of Jewish learning. This, no doubt, is a mistake. But his lore was surely considerable, as may be seen, e.g. from Dr. H. St. J. Thackeray's work on the subject.

In any case the Jewish culture is the only culture visible in St. Paul's Epistles. I mean, of course, what may be described as school-culture. Neither Greek literature, nor Stoic philosophy, nor—as I think—anything of current Greek religious ideas, is to be found in the Letters of Paul, beyond what may be regarded as the common property of everyone to whom the common Greek of the Levant was a native language. The acquaintance he shows with the "Mystery-religions" and their terminology seems to me exactly comparable to the acquaintance shown by many clergymen to-day with Evolution, who nevertheless have neither been trained in a laboratory nor read the *Origin of Species*. On the other hand his Jewish lore is certainly there: he brings it in even in writing to Galatians who were heathen before they were Christians. And both in quantity and in depth it is more than could have been derived from mere untaught study of the Scriptures; it is a real school-culture, the argumentation of an educated man.

There is one illustration of this, so important in itself that it is worthy of special notice in passing. The doctrine of the New Birth of the Christian in baptism is a well-established article of orthodox belief. It finds clear support in the New Testament from the Gospel of John and the Epistle known as 1 Peter. But this conception is one of the leading ideas in the Mystery-religions; *renatus in aeternum* is not a Christian but a pagan formula, connected with the dreadful ceremony of the Taurobolium. Con-

From *Christian Beginnings*, London, 1924, pp. 106-34. Used by permission of the publishers, University of London Press.

sequently it has been suggested that the very idea of the New Birth is one of the things which Christian thought has adopted from heathen religion.

It is therefore of great importance to notice that the idea of the New Birth is absent from the writings of St. Paul. What corresponds to it is a different idea, viz. that of the New Creation. This is a quite different idea: the baptized convert is not thought of as a child, but as one miraculously changed into a new and full-grown estate. It is congruous with all the rest of St. Paul's thinking; it involves miracle, but not magic. Now this peculiar phrase is not characteristic of the heathen mysteries, but it is found in Rabbinical theology. When God said to Abraham "I will make thee a great nation," this was explained to be not natural or inherent; it was a fresh act of God, a "new creation." Very likely St. Paul's phraseology may have at once suggested to his heathen converts the corresponding heathen idea, but it is clear that in this crucial instance "the Hellenization of the Gospel" is not due to St. Paul himself.

But however learned Paul may have been, and whatever remnants of the lore and exegetical methods of Rabbinism he may have continued to use, his fundamental ideas were utterly opposed to popular Judaism. He refused to regard himself as a rebel, and I fancy that his ordinary personal habits and predilections were those of a respectable Jew. But in theory he was an ethical anarchist, and the net result of his announcement of the Gospel in heathen lands was that many Gentiles claimed to be full members of the Church, who had never been circumcised and had no intention of ordering their life in accordance with the Law of Moses—or indeed, so far as the older Jewish Believers could make out, in accordance with any rules whatever. These older Believers had every reason to be alarmed. In the famous Conference, which we shall have to consider, Peter is said to have said something about the yoke of ordinances which even born Jews had found burdensome. This is a reasonable, common-sense plea coming from a Jew living in a Gentile society, and is doubly so if applied to a Gentile convert. But there is nothing about this in Paul's Letters. There is nothing at all about the "burdensomeness" or the "triviality" of the Law. Paul delighted in it after the inner man, in his better moments, when he was wishing to do God's will. His trouble was that he did not always *wish* to do God's will. He was not seeking a new style of living but motives for wishing to live well, and his complaint against the Law is that it did not help him to wish to live well. When St. Paul is talking about the Law, he is hardly ever thinking of ceremonies and tithes and phylacteries: he is thinking about the Ten Commandments. When he says "All things are allowable," he really means it. There is a "but," of course, there always is; only he was trying to make it an inner tendency, not an external compulsion. It is this remarkable psychological thinking that makes his Letters, when properly understood, so vivid and interesting to-day, so that familiar as they are they still sound in parts rather dangerous, and they must have sounded flamingly dangerous to the Believers in Jerusalem. Probably indeed they had never read the Letters themselves, but only heard garbled accounts of Paul's talk. No wonder there was a demand for a minimum of common

decency and behaviour from these Gentile newcomers, if they were to be received as fellow-worshippers.

In Acts xv we read that a Conference was held at Jerusalem, that an Agreement was reached which in effect was a victory for the inclusive, liberal view, but that a minimum of decent ethical observance was insisted on, which was embodied in a Decree or Circular Letter, which is quoted in full in Acts xv 23-29.

Every statement in the above sentences is a subject of controversy, and only a few points can be touched upon here. The most serious difficulty is to fit an acceptance of the Decree with the ethical system championed by St. Paul, for whereas most of the other difficulties come from our comparative ignorance, this comes from the express statements of the Apostle himself. I believe that there is a way of reconciliation, but it involves a particular view of the date and purport of almost all the earlier Epistles. I shall therefore come to these considerations last, after considering the Decree itself.

Is the Decree altogether a fiction, invented by Luke? This view indeed has been held, but it seems to me quite untenable. I should be fully prepared to find that Luke had rewritten it. If a copy of the original turned up in some ruin or grave I should not be surprised to find that it was couched in language that resembled a page of Mark rather than what we read in Acts. But I should expect the substance to be the same, for I do not think we have any reason to suspect the author of Acts of real bad faith. We are not, however, reduced to such general considerations. The writer of the Book of Revelation, himself in touch with Jewish Christianity if not actually a Jewish Christian, writing to the Church of Thyatira, reproves the lax ethical teaching current there, but tells those who have not received it "I put upon you no other burden." This at once suggests the words of the Apostolical Decree (Acts xv 28). But this is not all. What are the teachings of the false prophetess whom the Apocalypticist calls "Jezabel"? Why, he says that she teaches the servants of God to commit fornication and to eat things offered to idols! We do not quite know what is intended by this; probably the lady would have disclaimed these terms. As they stand, however, they are the two most important of the four practices condemned by name in the Decree. I think it is impossible to avoid regarding this passage in the Apocalypse otherwise than as a direct reference to the Decree. And, as it is most improbable that the writer derived his knowledge of it from Acts itself, it follows that the author of Acts did not invent the Decree.

What does the Decree mean? Is it a food-law, or a moral injunction? As we all know, there is here an important "various reading." "Things strangled" are omitted by Codex Bezae and the "Western" authorities generally, and the same authorities mostly add to the prohibitions, now reduced to three, a negative form of the "Golden Rule." By this means the food law is turned into a moral catechism. "Things offered to idols" are then understood to mean idolatry in general, "blood" to mean murder, and "fornication" all breaches of the seventh commandment.

It is a very nice question. The best defence of the theory that the Decree is a moral catechism is Lake's, in *The Earlier Epp. of St. Paul*, pp. 48-60. Lake there defends a text like Tertullian's, which omits both *καὶ πνικτῶν* and the negative form of the Golden Rule. But on the whole I think that the ordinary Alexandrian text, which must be regarded as being at least partly a food-law, raises the fewest difficulties. Paul's complaint against Peter in Gal. ii 12 was that after the arrival of certain strict believers from Jerusalem he would no longer *eat* with the Gentile Christians. And as we may at least suppose that the writer of Acts wrote from a generally consistent point of view it is appropriate to observe that what offended the stricter Jerusalemite believers in Acts xi 3 was not that Peter had baptized Cornelius, but that he had eaten with him.

There is one further consideration. What was the immediate use of this food-law for Gentile Christians? Not, I think, to ensure their own salvation, now or hereafter, but to ensure that Jewish believers who might be accepting their hospitality would not be offended or scandalized. It was the terms of inter-communion; and on this very subject what St. Paul says is, "Do not scandalize your more scrupulous fellow-believer with the food which you believe you may eat and he believes he may not eat" (Rom. xiv. 20, 21). Anyone who followed St. Paul's advice would automatically obey the Apostolic Decree.

We have thus come to what is after all the most important part of the question. If the substance of the Decree be genuine, how can we interpret the Letters of Paul? In attempting an answer to this I shall start from the Decree, arranging and explaining the several Letters with reference to it. Then at the end we shall see if the result is generally harmonious.

Galatians. The most natural interpretation of the biographical statements in Galatians i and ii is that they were written before the "Council" at Jerusalem. This implies what is called the South-Galatian theory, which means in effect that the persons addressed are the Christians of Antioch in Pisidia and of Derbe and Lystra in Lycaonia, about whom we read in Acts xiii and xiv. The visit to Jerusalem described by Paul in Gal. ii 1-10 corresponds then to Acts xi 30, not to Acts xv. The difficulties in this view, as I understand it, are consequential: in itself, so far as Acts and Galatians alone are concerned it seems a most attractive solution. The Letter, so we must think, will have been originally penned at the height of the dispute about circumcision, and was written, probably when Paul was actually on his way to Jerusalem, to encourage the Pisidian and Lycaonian converts to stand firm, whatever the Jewish-Christian conservatives might demand from them as of right. Incidentally it may be observed that the earlier Galatians is dated, the easier it is to explain the phrase in ii 8, which calls Peter an Apostle of the Circumcision, for the episode of Cornelius, however historical in itself, is narrated in Acts as quite an exceptional event, outside the usual sphere of Peter's activity. Further, the circumcision of Titus by Paul—for who can doubt that it was the knife which really did circumcise Titus that has cut the syntax of Gal. ii 3-5 to pieces?—the circumcision of Titus is far more likely to have been decided on by Paul at the earlier

period, when nothing was stabilized and individual concessions may have been graceful and wise, than at the very moment when Paul is fighting with all his powers against compelling Gentiles to submit to circumcision. If this early date be not accepted I do not see how Galatians can be reconciled with Acts. If the conference at Jerusalem was anything in the least like what we read in Acts xv, then Gal. ii 1-10 is a misleading account of it, and if Gal. ii 1-10 refers to Acts xi 30, but was written after the conference of Acts xv took place, then we cannot acquit St. Paul of a wilful and inexcusable suppression of material facts, facts which nevertheless would be fully in the hands of all his adversaries. But with the earlier date for Galatians all these serious difficulties disappear.

1 and 2 Corinthians. The group of Letters which we know as 1 and 2 Corinthians were written about A.D. 55, some five years after the Conference at Jerusalem, and the date we have assigned to Galatians. These years had witnessed great developments. The Gospel had been carried from Asia to Europe, wholly new classes of converts had been reached. The numbers of the Gentile Christians were now considerable: it is impossible to estimate the number in figures, but I suppose that whereas at the Conference at Jerusalem they may have been reckoned by dozens, at the time 1 Corinthians was being written they would have been reckoned by hundreds. In correspondence with this fact we notice that the position of the Gentiles is now assured. The only reference to circumcision in either Epistle is 1 Cor. vii 18, 19, where it seems to be brought in less for its own sake than as affording an analogy for the question of marriage or celibacy. St. Paul has plenty of opponents of course, but they do not seem to be exclusively or even mainly Jewish. "He is afraid, or has no authority, to ask for our financial support," or "he is not so full of the Spirit as others," or "his Letters are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak and his speech contemptible"—these seem to be the things that the adversaries were saying. There was no special reason why he should refer back to the rulings of the Conference four or five years ago. The case is quite different from that of the Galatian Epistle, in which he is professing to give a more or less connected statement of his relations with the heads of the Jerusalem Church.

All the same, it is remarkable how much of 1 Corinthians is taken up with questions concerning "things offered to idols," and "fornication." The latter subject occupies all chap. v, also vi 12-20, and all vii; the former all chap. viii and x 19-32. Does Paul in these passages agree with the Decree? Does he show himself loyal to his engagements? These questions are sometimes asked, but I do not think they admit of an answer, because they are not the right questions to ask. In the first place the Decree as given in Acts is not a treaty between St. Paul and St. James. We are not even told that Paul consented to it. It does not appear indeed that his consent was asked. As it stands it does no more than state the terms upon which the authorities at Jerusalem were willing to eat the food of Gentile believers, i.e. to accept their manner of life as decent and seemly. After all, the general purport of the Decree is that the "Judaizers" had had

no commission from the responsible folk at Jerusalem. Certain practices at the end are reprobated, but the intention of the document is obviously to allow most of what the Judaizers had represented as culpably lax.

But did Paul not approve of it? I imagine that he thought the requirements very sensible and reasonable, very suitable as a general guide to that large class of persons whom he speaks of as "weak." Rather than that such persons should suffer injury to their religious life he was prepared to do without meat and wine altogether. What he was not prepared to admit was that any rule was of obligation in itself, i.e. as binding between God and himself *qua* rule. If the thing was right in itself you ought to wish to do it, otherwise mere outward conformity was real rebellion. But on the other hand there is no reason why you should not obey the Law if you wanted to do so. And clearly, in a great many points, Paul's wishes were in conformity with the Law. He was convinced, obviously, that the Seventh Commandment was a good rule for human society, he was enthusiastically convinced that he was a member of Christ and it seemed to him shocking that a member of Christ should be "joined to a harlot" (1 Cor. vi 15). On this question, therefore, there was no opposition between him and the terms of the Decree. But what Paul desired was to persuade his disciples to obey the Decree for the same reasons that influenced him. The motive was everything to him: "whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

That is the high Paulinist doctrine. What, however, is also clear is that (like most theoretical anarchists) he did not always live up to it. In other moods Paul issues his own Decrees, and I do not find them always convincing. The whole of Christendom, so far as I know, has adopted his un-Jewish rule that men shall pray with their heads uncovered. It may be a good rule, but it does not seem to me so inevitably obvious as it seemed to Paul. And what did Louis XIV or John Milton or John Bunyan (who all had what we should call long hair) think of 1 Cor. xi 14? What would Paul have said if these men had told him that cropping their hair might have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility and severity to the body, but was not of any value or honour against the indulgence of the flesh? My point is, that St. Paul did not mind issuing ordinances on occasion. If therefore the recommendations in the Apostolical Decree happened to be such as in St. Paul's eyes "nature itself teaches" (1 Cor. xi 14), then I do not think he would have felt it inconsistent with "his" gospel to recommend them, even to enforce them. As I have said above, a good deal of 1 Corinthians is actually occupied with the two most important of the four recommendations of the Decree. And I imagine that Paul considered that the teaching of 1 Cor. viii was directly in accordance with it. The Decree said "Gentile Christians are not to eat things offered to idols," obviously therefore some Christians think this practice in itself wrong. Paul says: Intelligent Christians know that idols are nothing and that all things are lawful to eat. But some weaker brethren think this food is forbidden—if they think so, it *is* forbidden to them. If then they see you at a heathen feast, they will be emboldened to eat this food themselves, which to them is a sin. "Therefore," he concludes, "do not eat this food

yourselves for the sake of the conscience of others." In other words, the recommendation of Paul is the recommendation of the Decree: what is different is the ethical theory on which the recommendation is based.

St. Paul does not touch in 1 Corinthians or elsewhere upon "blood," or "things strangled," in connection with food. It does not seem to be quite certain what these words mean in practice. Obviously the significance or non-significance of Paul's silence in this matter depends upon whether the Corinthians were in the habit of eating *αῖμα* or *πνικτά* within the meaning of the Decree. How did they kill chickens at Corinth in the first century A.D.? Did they wring their necks or cut their heads off? Or did they practise the modern way? I have made some inquiries on this subject from my classical friends, but have not got much light. Yet it is obvious that until we know what went on in the Corinthian kitchens and back-yards of those days we are not in a position to judge St. Paul on this head. Perhaps he himself "asked no questions, for conscience' sake" (1 Cor. x 27).

Romans. It is clear that Rom. xv 19-29 was written shortly before Paul went up to Jerusalem for the last time, bearing with him the collection he had made from the Gentile Churches for the "poor among the saints" there. With this goes the long list of greetings in chap. xvi. It may surprise us that Paul had so large an acquaintance in Rome; in fact it has been suggested that this is a Postscript addressed elsewhere, e.g. Ephesus. For this there is no solid evidence: what is certain is that if the list be really Roman its size shows us that it comes late in the Apostle's career.

On the other hand, the rest of the Epistle is a theological treatise with no personal and local allusions, and both in style and subject-matter it is very closely allied to Galatians. It is very difficult to think of St. Paul beginning with Galatians, then going on to develop the style seen in 2 Cor. iv and v, then going back to Romans, and then onward once more to the Epistles of the captivity. Now in the matter of the date of Romans textual criticism really does come to the aid of literary and historical study, for the Epistle has been transmitted in two forms. There is an admirable discussion of the subject in Lake's *Earlier Epistles* (see esp. pp. 348, 362 f.), the upshot of which is that both forms are Pauline. The earlier form, consisting of Rom. i-xiv (with or without the great Doxology, xvi 25-27) was a circular letter or treatise, contemporary with Galatians: in this form no place-name was inserted in i 7 and 15. A copy of this circular letter, containing as it does St. Paul's theory of Law and Grace, the mission of Israel, and the bearing of the theory on Christian ethics, was sent by him to Rome when he was on his way to Jerusalem. The immediate occasion was to introduce Phoebe (xvi 1), who was no doubt the bearer of the Letter, to the Roman Christians.

The only thing I have to add to Professor Lake's argument is to remark that Rom. xv 1-13 seems to me exactly the sort of writing that we should expect in these circumstances. Rom. xiv 23 indeed is a real conclusion: nothing but a Doxology is really in place after it. But in the longer form Paul wanted to lead up to his personal statements in xv 19 ff., so he continues his own argument for a sentence or two, and then quotes

a few texts from the Prophets. Those of us who are writers, who have had occasion to adapt an address or a lecture designed for one audience to suit another, will at various times have been engaged on a similar task. No doubt Rom. xv 1-13 is not Paul at his best; it is a weld, a join, an adaptation. But those who have themselves attempted the same sort of work will be the last to be surprised at its defects.

In Rom. xiv we have the same doctrine about food-laws in general that is given in 1 Cor. viii with reference to "things offered to idols." We, the intelligent believers, should meet the scrupulous half-way by giving them no offense, while cherishing our internal freedom before God (xiv 22). It all seems to me completely in accordance with the Apostolical Decree, so far as the course of action recommended is concerned. And the Decree is only concerned with outward practices, not with religious theory.

1 and 2 Thessalonians. The scheme set out in the above paragraphs is, as I think, a satisfactory account of the relation of the four great Epistles of Paul to the Decree given in Acts. And, further, the order suggested, viz. Galatians and Romans (ed. 1), followed by 1 and 2 Corinthians, and then Romans (ed. 2), while arrived at from considerations connected with the Decree is found to be harmonious with the general style and tendencies of the Epistles themselves. But how on this scheme are we to explain the Thessalonian Epistles? Their date is obvious from 1 Thess. iii 1, 6: it must be while Paul is still at Athens, or perhaps on his first arrival at Corinth, i.e. only a few months after the Conference at Jerusalem. There is in these Letters no allusion to the Decree, unless a warning in 1 Thess. iv 2 f. against fornication be regarded as such, but this may be explained on the ground that the circumstances did not call for any allusion to it. The difficulty is that the Letters, while full of genuinely Pauline ideas and expressions, are as wholes much weaker in style than the four great Letters. If Paul had written Galatians six months before and had already composed the treatise that we know as Rom. i-xiv, is it conceivable that he would produce anything like 1 Thessalonians? And the same argument applies to 2 Thessalonians with even greater force.

Should we be impressed with this line of argument and regard the Thessalonian Letters as spurious we are confronted with a curious state of things. There was plenty of Pseudepigraphical writing in late-Judaism and among the early Christians, but the unauthentic document continually betrays itself by marks of a later date. Exactly the reverse is the case with the Thessalonian Letters. If the indications of the ostensible date were not so precise we should have very little difficulty in regarding them as works of Paul's earliest Christian period; for instance, when he was working under Barnabas at Antioch. There is no better summary of the earliest Christian creed than 1 Thess. i 9, 10. The whole outlook, indeed, is what might be described as pre-Pauline. Again, the details of the eschatological expectations are much more naïve than what we get in the other Epistles, e.g. in 1 Cor. xv: the Man of Sin and the Mystery of Lawlessness (2 Thess. ii 3, 7) never appear again. And I think it not unfair to note that

nowhere else in the Pauline Corpus do we find such hard words against the Jewish nation in general as in 1 Thess. ii 14-16. Yet we have reason to believe that at this very time Paul was still cherishing a hope of the final conversion of his much-beloved fellow-countrymen, and had recently expressed his hope in Rom. ix-xi.

.
To sum up, the conclusion here reached is that there is little reason to doubt the historicity of the substance of the Apostolic Decree given in Acts xv. It was a law regulating the diet and social behaviour that Gentile Christians must adopt if Jewish Christians were to feel free to eat with them. As a rule of life it was such as St. Paul would approve, or at least be quite ready to comply with, so long as it was understood by intelligent Christians to be a concession to the scruples of others, not a positive Divine ordinance. And further, this view helps us to determine with certainty the order of the composition of the earlier Pauline Epistles.

THE SAYINGS IN THE PAULINE NARRATIVE OF THE LAST SUPPER

Vincent Taylor

IN ORDER TO . . . study . . . the Passion-sayings connected with the story of the Last Supper it is necessary to examine St. Paul's account in 1 Cor. xi. 23-5:

For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was delivered up took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

As appearing in a letter written in 55 A.D., this narrative is early; but the phrase, "which also I delivered unto you," carries back the tradition to 51 A.D., when St. Paul first visited Corinth. It is probable, however, that the Apostle is thinking of the days immediately after his conversion and of the tradition made known to him at Damascus and Jerusalem. This is the natural interpretation of the words: "I received of the Lord." It is most improbable that the phrase, "from the Lord," implies a revelation comparable to that mentioned in Gal. i. 12. Neither the terms which are employed nor the contents of xi. 23-5 suggest a revelation, but rather an oral tradition such as the primitive communities were able to give. St. Paul is recording what he had learnt well within a decade of the death of Christ.

It would, however, be rash to suppose that his narrative must be accepted forthwith in all its details, as superior to the Markan and Lukan accounts of the Supper. How ancient the Synoptic narratives are, it is impossible to say, but they are certainly very much older than the Gospels in which they stand. Moreover, it may be that the details of 1 Cor. xi. 23-5 owe something to the effects of St. Paul's sojourn in Antioch and to his subsequent experiences during the Gentile Mission. No narrative, not even that of an eyewitness, is exempt from the possibility of interpretative modifications, and this danger is increased when, as in the case of xi. 23-5, it is received from intermediaries. For this reason the sayings in xi. 24 f. must be examined with care.

(a) *This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me* (1 Cor. xi. 24).

The first four words appear in every account of the Supper, and their genuineness is beyond dispute. The phrase, "which is for you," is peculiar

From *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, New York, 1937, pp. 201-17. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The Macmillan Company.

to St. Paul's account. Its absence from Mk. xiv. 22 is not in itself a decisive objection, since the idea at least is completely in line with the Markan representation of the self-offering of Jesus in x. 45 and xiv. 24. Dalman, however, thinks that "what is possible in Greek ($\tauὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν$), appears in Aramaic as a very unusual heaviness," and that the phrase must be considered "a hellenisation." Probably, as Jeremias suggests, its presence in the Pauline formulation is due to liturgical usage, and to the fact that the parallel expression: "which is poured out for you," which appears in Mk. xiv. 24, is not suitable in the saying regarding the cup in 1 Cor. xi. 25. On the whole, it is best to regard the phrase as an interpretative addition which correctly defines the words: "This is my body." The rest of the saying: "This do in remembrance of me," is also peculiar to 1 Cor. xi. 24, but as a similar command is found in 1 Cor. xi. 25, both passages may be considered together.

(b) *This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me* (1 Cor. xi. 25).

The relation of Mk. xiv. 24: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many," to 1 Cor. xi. 25 has already been discussed; and the conclusion reached was that it is not a variant of the Pauline saying. Is, then, 1 Cor. xi. 25 a variant of Mk. xiv. 24, or are the two independent sayings?

If it is necessary to choose between the two, the Pauline form must be regarded as secondary and derivative. The phrase, "This cup," is easily explained as a closer definition of the indefinite "This" in the Markan form. Such a modification might naturally be made in a Gentile environment in order to avoid the difficulties of the bolder Markan saying: "This is my blood of the covenant." Once this change is made the rest follows. It is no longer possible to express the predicate in the words: "is my blood of the covenant," since this form is intelligible only if the subject refers to the wine. The cup is not, of course, thought of apart from its contents, but when it is expressly mentioned as the subject, it becomes necessary to describe it as constituting the covenant made possible by the blood of Christ, and the adjective "new" is suggested by Jer. xxxi. 31 and by contrast with the covenant of Ex. xxiv. 8. The immediate implication is that the cup is the pledge of the covenant, though how far this idea would have been from satisfying the mind of St. Paul is clear from his impassioned question: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16). In the way suggested, then, it may be contended, the Pauline version came into existence in a form more intelligible to non-Jewish Christians than the challenging words of the Markan tradition.

This argument, it must be allowed, is attractive, and it may represent the facts. It is open, however, to at least two objections. Paul's words do not suggest that he is giving a later form of the saying; he shows no knowledge of any other form and implies that he is recording the original tradition. He may, of course, have been mistaken. Does he not show, in 1 Cor. i. 14-6, a confused recollection of those whom he had baptized? However

this may be, in 1 Cor. xi. 23-5, as in 1 Cor. xv. 3-7, he speaks with such deliberation of matters which had been the subject of his teaching that it is difficult to believe that he is reproducing a form of the saying which first became current in a Gentile community. A second objection is that the explanation is not really necessary. 1 Cor. xi. 23 may be as original as Mk. xiv. 24 itself. It has already been suggested that the saying: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many," may not have been fully understood at the time. While this admission is no argument against their genuineness, it suggests the possibility that Jesus may have expounded His own words. Is the saying found in 1 Cor. xi. 25 part of His interpretation? Criticism is rightly on its guard against "harmonizing expedients"; but when it can be shown that one saying is probably not derived from a second, and that the second need not be a variant of the first, there is matter for reflection. It is especially important to avoid the delusion that different accounts of the Supper are self-contained and mutually exclusive. Form-criticism reminds us that such narratives are merely the rounded residues of earlier stories from which much has fallen away, and that the sayings they contain are those which attracted the interest of the narrators. Similar sayings in different narratives may be, but need not be, identical; on the contrary, they may be original variations on the same theme. How far these principles can be applied in the present case, it may be impossible to decide, but there is certainly as much reason to explain 1 Cor. xi. 25 as an original interpretation of Mk. xiv. 24 as to adopt the hypothesis of secondary modification.

Hesitation to decide between these competing views is disappointing, but the very fact that we are compelled to hesitate adds force to the contention of Jeremias that, essentially, the meaning of 1 Cor. xi. 25 and of Mk. xiv. 24 is the same. "With τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον Paul means not the cup, but its contents." "Mark and Matthew, as much as Paul, compare the wine with the blood by the shedding of which the new covenant is established." If this opinion is sound, it matters less whether 1 Cor. xi. 25 is an original utterance, and the practical question is which passage gives the theologian firmest ground for his special work. On this issue there is hardly room for serious doubt: with Jeremias, he is well advised to select the words of Mk. xiv. 24: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many."

Attention must now be given to the command to repeat the rite in 1 Cor. xi. 24 f.: "This do in remembrance of me," "This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." For various reasons, these words are widely regarded as secondary additions. The grounds for this opinion may be summarized as follows: (1) The words are wanting in Mk. and in Mt.; (2) In suggesting the thought of a memorial meal, they introduce a new idea not found in the other accounts; (3) The terminology is that found in ancient formulae used with reference to the commemoration of the dead; (4) The sayings reflect the interests of the primitive communities rather than those of Jesus.

Our conclusion, then, is that, in recording the sayings which command

the continued observance of the Supper, St. Paul has preserved an original element in the tradition not mentioned by the Synoptists. If this view is accepted, it enlarges our conception of what Jesus had in mind in instituting the Supper. He not only intended His disciples to share in the power of His self-offering on the night of the Arrest; He meant them to continue so to do. In breaking bread and in drinking the cup they were to bring Him and His Messianic work powerfully to mind until He should come with power and great glory. This is a thought of Jesus which St. Paul has truly expressed when he writes: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 26).

In view of the importance of St. Paul's account, it is necessary to examine his interpretation of the significance and meaning of the Supper. Such an inquiry ought to throw light on the question whether his narrative is influenced by his doctrinal views; it ought also to help us to interpret the Supper itself and the meaning it had for Jesus.

There can be no doubt that St. Paul's thought is sacramental in the sense that he regards material things as means for the manifestation and appropriation of spiritual realities. This is true of his doctrine of the Person of Christ, of his conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, and of his description of the individual Christian, and of the Church, as the temple of the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16 f., vi. 19 f.). But this aspect of his thought is especially evident in his treatment of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper. The fathers of the Jewish Church were "baptized into Moses" by their experiences in the wilderness and at the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 2), and the Christian believer is "baptized into Christ," and therefore "into his death" (Rom. vi. 3). "We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4). This teaching does not mean that, "as a rite, and apart from moral and spiritual factors, Baptism effects spiritual benefits: such a deduction would be a complete perversion of Pauline thought, with its strong emphasis upon the ethical element in the idea of faith-union with Christ. None the less, it does imply that Baptism is both an opportunity and a means of establishing a spiritual relationship with Christ.

St. Paul's views regarding the Supper can be inferred from 1 Cor. x. 1-4, 14-22, and xi. 20-34.

The first of these passages is one of warning based upon the experiences of the Israelites in the wilderness who, in spite of the highest privileges, became idolators, fornicators, and murmurers against God. It is in this context that he speaks of the manna as "spiritual meat" and of the water obtained from the rock as "spiritual drink" (x. 3 f.); in a mystical sense he can even declare that "the rock was Christ" (x. 4). There can be no doubt that he is thinking in terms suggested by the Eucharist, and, if this is so, it is natural to infer that he thought of the bread and the wine as spiritual meat and drink, and of the Eucharist as in a true sense mediating Christ to the believer. Just as clearly it must be inferred that he did not think of it as a mechanical means of grace. "Now these things happened

unto them by way of example," he says of the privileged Israelites, "and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come" (x. 11).

The second section, 1 Cor. x. 14-22, is more explicit. Once more it is a warning against idolatry. St. Paul does not believe that an idol is anything, but he does believe that in eating things sacrificed to idols the Corinthians incur the danger of entering into communion with evil powers. "I would not," he writes, "that ye should have communion with demons" (x. 20). Strange as it is to the modern mind, this thought is based on ancient conceptions of sacrifice, and, in particular, upon the idea that to eat of the sacrifice is to share in the sacrificial act itself, and therefore to enter into fellowship with spiritual powers. That this view was held by St. Paul himself is clear from his question: "Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar?" (x. 18). In these words he is thinking, not so much of the altar itself, but of the God whose altar it is, and of the offering made thereon. Nothing less than this inference does justice to his words.

In itself, the use of this illustration suggests that St. Paul thinks of the Eucharist as a means of entering into communion with Christ and of sharing in His sacrifice. This conclusion, however, is not left to inference, for he writes: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" (x. 16). The incidental introduction of this question is worthy of note; it merely prepares the way for the plea that to eat meat sacrificed to idols is spiritually dangerous. The implication is that he is assuming a view of the Eucharist shared equally by his readers and himself. It is inadequate to understand "communion" (*κοινωνία*) of a fellowship of believers instituted by Christ. This is the secondary idea of the section, suggested in the words: "seeing that there is one bread, we who are many, are one body" (x. 17, R.V. mg.); but that it is not the main thought is clear when St. Paul sets side by side the Supper and the pagan sacrifice, and says: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of demons" (x. 21). By communion of the body and blood of Christ St. Paul means a vital relation with Christ Himself as the Crucified Saviour.

The third section, 1 Cor. xi. 20-34, is of even greater interest and importance, because from verses 26-34 it is possible to infer with some confidence what his view of the Eucharist must have been.

When he says: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye are proclaiming the Lord's death till he come" (xi. 26), he is thinking of the Eucharist, not merely as publishing the fact of the death, but as making it known for what it is, a work, namely, of reconciliation. He does not say this, it is true, but, in the light of his treatment as a whole, it is impossible to believe that his thought is simply that the acts of eating and drinking recall the circumstances of the original Supper and of the tragic events which followed. It is surely the nature of the death that is in mind and the appropriation of its blessings by men; and since reconciliation is the

fundamental conception under which he thinks of the work of Christ, it is natural to suppose that it is under this category that the death is proclaimed. The Eucharist, he says, in effect, is an acted sermon; it is the drama of redemption, in which common physical acts, eating and drinking, represent and provide the opportunity for the spiritual appropriation of that which Christ made possible by His death.

It is just because St. Paul can think so highly of the Eucharist that he feels so keenly the scandal of the Corinthian celebrations, with their divisions, heresies, and shameful disorders. These facts of the situation are in his mind when he speaks of eating the bread, or drinking the cup, "unworthily." The disorders ruin the sermon and destroy the drama, so that the death is no longer proclaimed as a work of reconciliation. So strong is his feeling that he declares that "whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord" (xi. 27). These words are a rhetorical statement unless, in the Apostle's thinking, the bread and the wine are, in some sense, the body and blood of Christ. So necessary is this inference, that reluctance to accept it can only be explained by the fear that one is thereby committed to the view that St. Paul held a doctrine of Transubstantiation. Such a fear is groundless. St. Paul's thinking is poles asunder from the mediaeval belief that the "substance" of bread and of wine is miraculously transformed into the "substance" of the body and blood of Christ. What he means is illustrated by his statement that the rock of Kadesh "was Christ." The bread and the wine are mystically the body and blood of the Lord, and have this meaning and value because of His word and action (cf. xi. 24 f.).

This conception, however, does not represent the whole of St. Paul's thought. He clearly believes that the significance of the Eucharist is ethically conditioned. On the one hand, he does not think that the meaning of the bread and wine is purely a subjective creation on the part of those who participate in the Supper. In his belief, the elements possess a God-given potency. He holds that direct physical ills have fallen upon the Corinthian Christians because they have received them unworthily. "For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep" (xi. 30). To the modern mind this is a sub-Christian belief which conceives the Eucharist in magical terms, although few would deny that to participate in the Eucharist unworthily, in a wrong ethical and religious spirit, is to expose oneself to the divine condemnation. We prefer, that is to say, to use abstract expressions, or at least to leave "the divine judgment" undefined, whereas St. Paul prefers to speak definitely and concretely. Be this as it may, St. Paul's language implies that he did not think the significance of the elements to be one which exists only in the mind of the recipient; their value and meaning are determined by God.

On the other hand, it is equally clear that he cannot have thought of the bread and the wine as the body and the blood of Christ, apart from the spiritual attitude and intellectual apprehension of the participant. That he attached the greatest importance to these conditions is obvious from

his solemn exhortation: "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup" (xi. 28). The divisions, schisms, and ostentatious actions of the Corinthian Christians are undoubtedly in his mind as he writes these words, and it may be inferred that by a "worthy" participation he means one that is marked by the spirit of unity, of humility, and of love. But the question also arises whether, along with these spiritual qualities, an intellectual grasp of what the Eucharist means, must not be included; for St. Paul continues: "For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he judge not rightly the body" (μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα). Some commenators have supposed that, by "the body," the Church is meant, but, in the absence of some clearer indication of a change of reference, it is much more probable that the term has the same meaning which it bears in the immediate context in verse 27. The "body" is that of the Crucified Lord symbolized by the broken bread. The words indicate that the proving, of which verse 28 speaks, has an intellectual as well as a moral character. The man is not only to examine his motives and his conduct, but also whether he has perceived what is involved in eating the bread and in drinking the cup. The implication is that it is upon this kind of self-examination that the opportunity presented to him in the Eucharist depends; only so are the bread and the wine the body and the blood of Christ to him. St. Paul's view is that the blessings of the Eucharist are received, neither *ex opere operato* nor merely by the exercise of faith, but by the power of God under moral and intellectual conditions.

From this study of St. Paul's thought it appears that, if allowance is made for the fact that he is dealing with an actual situation in the course of his ministry, the ideas are, substantially, those which are implicit in the narrative of Mk. xiv. 22-5, where Jesus, both by His actions and His words, institutes the Supper as a means whereby His disciples may share in the power of His surrendered life and anticipate the joy of the perfected Kingdom. It is surprising, in view of his strong eschatological expectations, that St. Paul does not give fuller consideration to the relationship of the Supper to the hope of the Parousia. A reference to this relationship appears in his words: "Ye proclaim the Lord's death *till he come*" (xi. 26), but it is not developed further. The explanation is doubtless to be found in the fact that he is not directly unfolding his eucharistic beliefs, but is dealing only with the points which concern a definite situation. In his treatment, however, he fixes upon what is most fundamental, the relation, namely, in which the Eucharist stands to the sacrifice of Jesus and to the appropriation of its blessings by the believer. In this vital conception the teaching of Jesus and of St. Paul is the same.

A noteworthy feature of 1 Cor. xi. 23-5 is the objectivity of the account of the Supper. In the three sections which have been examined St. Paul expresses thoughts which can legitimately be based on the narrative, but he does not introduce them into the story itself. How easy it would have been to give a description of the original Supper enriched by his own experience and by that of the Church! In point of fact, he does not do

this to any marked degree. If the phrase, "which is for you," attached to the words, "This is my body," is an expansion, it is, as we have urged, an addition which only brings out what is already implied. We have claimed that the words regarding the repetition of the rite are original; but, even if this view is not accepted, the phrases are not Pauline inventions and only express what already was generally believed. A study, then, of St. Paul's doctrine of the Eucharist throws into strong relief the fidelity with which he records the original tradition.

The character of the narrative bears on the question raised by the frequent assertion that the sacramental element in early Christian tradition is the creation of St. Paul who was deeply influenced by pagan Mystery-conceptions. This issue, however, is of such importance that it must be treated more broadly.

The assertion gains plausibility by exploiting the similarities between the Eucharist and such traces as exist of sacred meals in connection with the Mystery-religions, and by passing lightly over the distinctive elements in St. Paul's teaching. The well-known invitation: "Chaeremon requests your company at dinner at the table of the Lord Sarapis in the Serapaeum to-morrow, the 15th, at 9 o'clock," tells us very little about the character of the feast in question; and this is still more true of the formula handed down by Firmicus Maternus: "I have eaten out of the *τύμπανον*, I have drunk out of the *κύμβαλον*, I have become an initiate of Attis." A credible account of the manner in which the alleged influences can have developed St. Paul's teaching, has yet to be supplied. Meantime, it is important to observe that to the Apostle the Eucharist is neither an initiation ceremony, nor a rite of deification, nor a simple memorial feast to the departed. Its closer affinities indeed are Jewish. It is notable that in 1 Cor. x., xi., all the illustrations, apart from that of eating in an idol's temple, which is prompted by the circumstances of the readers, are drawn from the Old Testament. Further, St. Paul's teaching throughout moves in personal and spiritual realms. For him the bread and the wine are not so much "food for the soul" as media for participating in a redeeming activity. The end in view is fellowship with a Saviour and a sharing in His sacrifice. Finally, as we have seen, the ethical and social virtues are strongly emphasized. Where these are actively present, the Eucharist becomes what it is meant to be: otherwise, it is an instrument of condemnation. This feature alone is enough to discourage the hypothesis of pagan borrowing. Added to the characteristics already mentioned, it stamps the idea of the rite as a unique and original conception, into the significance of which St. Paul was permitted to see more deeply than any other New Testament writer, but which owes its origin to Jesus Christ Himself.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST AS A SACRIFICE

Charles A. Anderson Scott

IT WOULD BE a serious mistake to conclude that if the "propitiation" passage in Romans iii. proves to have to do with Reconciliation rather than with propitiation in the sense we commonly give to the word, Paul did not therefore look upon the death of Christ as a sacrifice. We have now to consider the evidence that he did so regard it, and to ascertain if possible the character which he assigned to that sacrifice.

We may take as a starting point some sentences from Johannes Weiss: "According to many of St. Paul's utterances salvation is so deeply anchored in the nature and the love of God that one must at least raise the question, on what grounds then was the work of Christ still necessary? The answer cannot possibly be to the effect that the necessity proceeded from God, or was founded on His nature. There is only one single passage in Paul (Ro. iii. 25 f.) in which the idea is to be found, unexpressed, it may be, yet underlying, that for His righteousness' sake God could not waive an expiatory sacrifice. But even this idea is so passing and so indirectly expressed that it cannot have played any great part."

There are, however, not a few other passages in which, although that particular idea is not present, different factors in Salvation appear in close connection with "the blood of Christ," and still others where His death is connected with the idea of sacrifice. And it is natural that the exegesis which found an expiatory sacrifice postulated in Romans iii. should find in all these other passages allusions to a sacrifice of the same kind. The outstanding passages of this type are: "In whom we have redemption through his blood" (Eph. i. 7); "being justified in his blood" (Ro. v. 9); "we have been reconciled to God through the death of his Son" (Ro. v. 10); "through him to reconcile all things to himself, having made peace through the blood of the cross" (Col. i. 20); "but now hath he reconciled through his flesh-body, through his death" (Col. i. 22); "but now have been brought near in his blood" (Eph. ii. 13).

It is by no means easy to say what is the significance to be attached to this language when we cease to read it in the light of the "propitiation passage" as traditionally interpreted. On the one hand, we have the language itself, and the interpretation which it is natural to put upon it—the blood as the instrument whereby, or the medium wherein, justification is secured, or redemption effected, or peace established. There is further the efficacy which is assigned to the blood of the sacrifices in Leviticus (xvii.

From *Christianity According to St. Paul*, Cambridge, 1939, pp. 85-97. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Cambridge University Press.

11); "the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." And again, there is the fact that other writers in the New Testament do seem to have found their explanation of the efficacy of Christ's death in the analogy of Levitical sacrifice. [E.g. Jo. i. 29; 1 Jo. i. 7, iv. 10; Heb. ix. 22 ff.; 1 Pet. i. 24.] The language they use does at any rate draw illustration of the effect of Christ's death from the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and suggests that what was understood to be secured by them was effected perfectly by it.

These are weighty considerations. Yet there are others.

(1) The very variety of the functions which in these passages are ascribed to the "blood" robs the language of much of its impressiveness. By it or by the death men obtain justification, redemption, reconciliation; by it they are brought near, and peace is made; and at the same time reconciliation is traced to "his flesh-body through death." This variety of expression suggests that we are in presence not of a technical, but of a general idea. The efficacy which is thus assigned to the "blood" goes far beyond the scope claimed for it in Leviticus, where its effect is only negative, the "covering" or neutralising of that which forbids safe or acceptable worship of God. These varied and positive effects which Paul ascribes to the "blood of Christ," though they may find a faint analogy in the Levitical sacrifices, point to a much wider meaning for the phrase. It stands for the death of Christ in its completeness and in all the horror of its circumstances. That death was for Paul a necessary link in the process whereby God wrought the Salvation of men in all its forms and implications.

(2) Continuity with the Levitical theory of sacrifice is further weakened to a thin analogy by the wide difference in regard to the character of the sins which sacrifice was understood to deal with. Under the Levitical system only sins of ignorance were capable of being atoned for by sacrifice. "The class of offences said to be done with a high hand were capital, and followed by exclusion from the community. The sins of error and ignorance could be removed by sacrifice and offering. The Old Testament sacrificial system was a system of atonement only for the so-called sins of inadvertence." As to the class of sins done with a high hand, which the sacrifices did not touch, "upon the whole they were the sins forbidden by the moral law." But it was with these sins against the moral law and with sin in a still deeper sense that Paul was concerned. It was with these that he believed that Christ had dealt. Whether it were due to the teaching of the Master Himself (cp. Mk. vii. 14-23), or to other influences, Paul had learnt what it is that really defiles a man, *i.e.* disqualifies him for communion with God. It was sin in that sense, sin of that kind, in connection with which he believed that Christ had died and for which Christ had procured forgiveness. The difference in the scope which is thus claimed for the sacrifice of Christ is so great that it is difficult to believe that Paul saw in it only an extended application of the principle underlying the Leviti-

cal sacrifices, or that he could have failed in that case to draw attention to the difference.

(3) And there is a more general consideration which points in the same direction, namely, the improbability that the Levitical theory of sacrifice, or indeed the sacrifices themselves, bulked largely in the religious life and thinking of one brought up in Paul's circumstances. The contrary opinion has weighed heavily in the discussion of our problem; nevertheless, it is probably erroneous. The reasons cannot be more than indicated here. For Jews of the Diaspora, as even for those who lived in Galilee, the sacrificial ceremonial of the Temple could have only a distant and an indirect bearing on personal religion. For two or three centuries at least the Synagogue and the Law had supplied and secured for the great majority of the Jewish race the religious privileges which were otherwise provided by the Temple and the sacrifices. Moreover, the theory of sacrifice which found expiatory and "atoning" value in the blood belongs entirely to the latest stratum in the Pentateuchal legislation. It finds no support or recognition in the prophets. By many of them indeed the whole sacrificial system had been sharply criticised. Jesus Himself had said: "Go ye and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice." The sentence in Hebrews (ix. 22), even if it refers to sins, which is doubtful, does not represent the universal or even the general view of Judaism on the subject. The prophetic criticism of sacrifices in general, the inferior prestige of the second Temple, involving in some quarters doubt as to the validity of its ceremonial, and the wide acceptance of a theory of forgiveness grounded on human repentance and Divine mercy, and quite independent of sacrifice—all these considerations make it highly improbable that St Paul would feel it necessary to explain the efficacy of Christ's death in terms of the "priestly" theory of atonement.

It would appear therefore that some other explanation must be found for Paul's emphasis on "the blood," and for the effects attributed to it in the passages quoted above. This has been so strongly felt by some modern scholars that attempts have been made to find a mystical or spiritual meaning for the language. It has been described as "a vivid way of realising the Living One who is also the Crucified, and with whom Paul lives in mystic, spiritual fellowship of blood." Or, it has been connected with "the blood-fellowship with the exalted Lord continually renewed through the Eucharist." But this is to give an illegitimate extension to the idea of mystical union, and that by pressing the language further than it will bear. No doubt Paul when speaking of "the blood of Christ" referred to His outpoured life, but it was His life outpoured upon the Cross. And he used the phrase as a concentrated expression of all that was involved in and exhibited in the sacrificial death of Christ, in which he saw the mediating cause of Redemption, Justification and Reconciliation.

There can be no doubt that Paul set the death of Christ at the very centre of his thinking and teaching on the subject of Salvation. He did not, however, isolate it, but held it always in the closest connection with the Incarnation on the one hand, and the Resurrection on the other. Bearing

this in mind, we return to the question, In what sense did he regard the death of Christ as a sacrifice?

That he did so regard it is again beyond doubt. It was a voluntary self-offering, a voluntary acceptance of pain, shame and death, made on behalf of men, in connection with their sins, and in furtherance of the saving purpose of God. This is the case in spite of the fact that the Apostle never (unless it were in Romans iii. 25) states it definitely and unmistakably. Apart from Romans iii. 25 there are two passages in which he connects the death of Christ with sacrificial language, Ephesians v. 2 and 1 Corinthians v. 7. But it will be found on careful examination that neither of these throws light on the character of the sacrifice. The former passage runs: "Christ loved you and gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." The force of this, the only passage in which Paul describes Christ as a sacrifice (*θυσία*), is considerably weakened by the facts (1) that the phrase is a combination of reminiscences from the Psalms. As Dr Armitage Robinson says, *προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν* is probably borrowed half-unconsciously from Psalm xl., and the second phrase *ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας* is certainly so; (2) Paul himself elsewhere uses both phrases, with no apparent difference of meaning, to describe human acts of devotion and self-surrender. In Romans xii. 1 he uses both "sacrifice" and "offering" of the act and life of self-surrender apart from any deeper connotation of sacrifice; and in Romans xv. 16 "offering" with the same meaning. "For a sweet-smelling savour" appears once in connection with the preaching of the Gospel (2 Cor. ii. 14) and once in connection with the gifts sent by the Philippians to himself (Phil. iv. 18), a fact, says Dr Robinson, "which should warn us against pressing it too strongly to a doctrinal use" in the passage in Ephesians. Due consideration given to their history and to the context in which they stand these phrases in Ephesians appear rather to describe our Lord's surrender and submission of Himself as complete and acceptable, than to ascribe any definite character to His sacrifice.

The second instance of definitely sacrificial language connected with the death of Christ is in 1 Corinthians v. 7: "for our passover has been sacrificed, even Christ." While this confirms the conclusion that Paul regards the death of Christ as a sacrifice, it does not afford the light we might expect upon the character of the sacrifice. Read with its context the phrase is seen to be introduced in order to support an appeal for purity. Like the leaven at the passover-time moral impurity is to be swept out of the Christian community. For in a very real sense it is passover-time with them. Have they not their own Paschal lamb, even Christ? Their life is to be a continuous feast of remembrance, a feast also at which Christ forms the spiritual nourishment. It behoves them therefore to exclude finally all manner of corrupting elements in the moral life. It must be remembered also that the Passover rite had gone through many changes in the course of its history, changes both of form and of significance; and it is impossible to say to which stage of its history Paul's thought attached itself. If it should seem probable that the rite would have for him its contemporary rather than any antiquarian significance, then the sacrificial idea would be at-

tenuated almost to the point of disappearing. The lamb was slain, but the ritual use of the blood had fallen into the background, indeed into abeyance. It was now the eating, the common sacred meal, that was emphasized. The passover, as Benzinger says, "is now divested of its sacrificial character; it is a domestic feast."

As we have seen, the context in which we find this allusion seems to indicate this as the significance of the rite which had appealed to Paul. In any case, the passage cannot be used to throw light on the character of Christ's sacrifice. This is clearly stated by Dr Denney. "It is implied that there is an entire incongruity between a life of sin and a life determined by a relation to the sacrificial death of Christ. But we could not from this passage make out what according to St Paul was the ground of this incongruity. It would be wrong in a passage with this simply allusive reference to urge the significance of the lamb in Exodus xii. and xiii., and to apply this to the sacrifice of Christ."

Thus, apart from the presupposition created by the traditional exegesis of Romans iii. 25 there does not appear in Paul's language connected with sacrifice anything to show what precise character he assigned to the sacrifice of Christ.

We have to search therefore for more general indications. From these we learn that

(1) It was a sacrifice *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, "on our behalf," "for our benefit." "He loved me," says Paul, with a rare touch of individualism, "He loved me, and gave himself for me" (Gal. ii. 20). "Christ died" *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* (Ro. v. 8).

(2) It was a sacrifice "on account of (*ὑπὲρ*) our sins" (1 Cor. ix. 3), "in connection with (*περὶ*) sin" (Ro. viii. 3; cp. Gal. i. 4): and those for whom He died were *ἀσεβεῖς* "ungodly," *ἁμαρτωλοὶ* "sinners" (Ro. v. 6, 8).

(3) It was a sacrifice the purpose and result of which was to restore or to establish a relation of amity, love, sonship between men and God; it achieved that by "commending to them his love," by drawing men to Christ (cp. Jo. xii. 32) and so to God (cp. 1 Pet. iii. 18); it was the means or instrument of Reconciliation.

(4) It was a necessary sacrifice because without it men could not have secured emancipation from the evil forces which held them down, or the restoration of a right relation to God, or been moved to believe in and accept the forgiving love of a Holy God, and so to find that Life which vanquishes death in all its forms. Without it Salvation would not have been accomplished.

(5) It was a sacrifice in accordance with the mind and will of God; it gave effect to His purpose. The Justification of which it was the mediating cause had had "witness borne to it by the law and the prophets" (Ro. iii. 21); that is to say, in modern speech, it was in accordance with, and in fulfilment of, the whole trend of the revelation of God contained in the Old Testament. Therefore it was that God "spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all." It was God who "set forth" His Son upon the cross as one with reconciling power.

(6) It was a sacrifice in which Christ appeared and acted as a Representative, and that in a two-fold aspect. He represented God to man. "God was in Christ" pronouncing the doom of sin, breaking its dominion over man as well as that of all the other forces of evil, waiving the legal demands of a broken law, drawing men, reconciling the world, unto Himself. But Christ also represented man to God. And that not in any merely official or statutory sense, but in a capacity of representation which was inherent in Him as the Head of a New Humanity. We are here once more confronted by the idea of solidarity, and somewhat baffled by it; for it has almost disappeared before our modern individualism. It was universal in the ancient world. A father and his family, a chieftain and his clan, a king and his people, in each case the head was necessarily and inherently the representative of the body. What he did they did. His default was their default, his achievement their achievement. The Old Testament is full of incidents and utterances which find their only explanation in this principle.

St Paul saw in Christ the Founder and Head of a new humanity, a second Adam. As such He summed up in Himself the Race which was to be, the Race of those who through faith in Him came into filial relation with God. He was their Representative. His achievement was their achievement. His obedience their obedience.

(7) The feature in the sacrifice of Christ to which Paul does give prominence and significance is His obedience. In 2 Corinthians x. 5 he singles out that quality as specially characteristic of Christ, so that He was therein an example to His followers. In Philippians ii. 8 he points to the Cross as the supreme illustration of that obedience. And in Romans v. 13-18 he expounds the result of that obedience upon the relation between man and God. That relation had been disturbed as a mutual one, destroyed by sin, in the first instance by the disobedience of Adam. Adam, as the head of the race and its representative, had involved his posterity in the wrong relation which resulted; and each individual man had endorsed that wrong relation by acts of sin. This was the situation with which Christ had dealt in His life, but supremely in His death, of obedience. Thus Paul writes: "So then as one transgression issued in condemnation falling upon all men, in the same way one act of righteousness has issued in righteousness that leads to life for all men. For as through the disobedience of an individual man the rest of men passed into the status of sinners, so through the obedience of one man the rest of men received the status of righteous."

As we have already seen, Paul was not the originator of this theory according to which Adam had entailed guilt and sin upon his posterity. He appeals to it as a commonly accepted opinion. The argument he draws from it depends upon two assertions, the one that Christ was, no less than Adam, a Representative man, the other that He had performed an act of obedience of such a character as to cancel for all who belong to Him by faith the act of disobedience on the part of Adam together with its consequences for his race. The Apostle's argument in Romans v. 15-17 is complicated and slightly obscured by his desire to show not only that the

effect of Christ's death in entailing consequences on others is similar to that of the disobedience of Adam, but that it is vastly greater; the difference being due to the superiority in the scale of being of the second Adam to the first. But all obscurity disappears at *v.* 18. Each sentence is carefully balanced, and in particular the meaning of *δικαίωμα* is given by the parallelism with *παράπτωμα*, act of transgression, and confirmed by the following verse in which *ὑπακοή*, obedience, clearly corresponds to *παρακοή*, disobedience. So that in spite of the fact that *δικαίωμα* in *v.* 16 has meant "sentence of acquittal," it means here "act of right, or righteousness." Christ's act of righteousness was His obedience, the sacrificial death upon the Cross in accordance with the will of God.

And there is probably a closer relation than appears upon the surface between the idea of obedience and that of sacrifice. The condition of receiving the Divine forgiveness being true repentance, not merely sorrow for sin but a change of mind or attitude towards God and possibly towards men, an obvious difficulty presented itself; and that was the difficulty of making sure that the repentance was sincere. Hence arose the demand for acts of penitence, such as fasting, almsgiving, "works meet for repentance." And alongside of these sacrifice also had an important function in guaranteeing that the sinner was truly repentant. Just as almsgiving came to be identified with "righteousness," so a close relation might be observed between "obedience" or an indefeasible act of obedience and sacrifice. The death of Christ was a sacrifice inasmuch as it was a supreme act of submission to the will of God.

And what was in Him obedience was for those whose Representative He was the equivalent of a guarantee of their obedience, an obedience which in their case required and implied repentance. Seeing that this guarantee was completely and sufficiently provided in the sacrificial death of Christ, it is possible to understand how Paul could see in the *αἷμα*, the out-poured life of Christ, the instrument whereby Salvation in any of its forms had been secured. The shedding of the blood is the consummation of the obedience, its irrefragable demonstration. And as the obedience of one, the Head and Representative, was the indispensable condition of justification for those whom He represented, it would be natural for the Apostle to use such language as "justified by his blood."

The righteousness which is the content of justification is, according to Paul, neither imputed nor imparted; it is a status conferred, not as had previously been believed, on the ground of merit, but on the ground of faith; and that faith was faith in God particularly as He was revealed in the sacrifice of Christ.

THE AGAPE OF THE CROSS

Anders Nygren

BEYOND ALL DOUBT the Cross is the centre of Paul's preaching. It is his conscious endeavour "not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" (1 Cor. ii. 2). The Gospel which he is sent to preach is no other than the word of the Cross of Christ. He takes anxious care lest anything else come in by the side of this Gospel, or in any way take its place, "lest the Cross of Christ should be made void" (1 Cor. i. 17). For, he continues, "the word of the Cross is to them that are perishing foolishness, but to us which are being saved it is the power of God"; the Jews are always asking for a sign, and the Greeks seeking for wisdom, "but we preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block, and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (verse 23 f.).

For Paul the Cross was as much the symbol of the new Way of fellowship with God as the Law had been of the old. But where the Law had failed to lead him to fellowship with God, now, apart from the Law, a true way of fellowship with God had been manifested; God himself had set forth Christ, the crucified, as a propitiation (Rom. iii. 20, 25). Paul's Gospel, therefore, necessarily implies that the Way of the Law is superseded. It is equally evident that the idea of love takes a primary place in his exposition of God's dealings with men. We do not, indeed, yet find the formal identification, God=Agape, but the idea is substantially present. Paul speaks of God as "the God of Agape" (2 Cor. xiii. 11), and of Christians as "taught of God" in the measure that they exhibit Agape (1 Thess. iv. 9).

It would, however, be entirely false to say that we have in his teaching two focal points, the Cross and Agape; the two are viewed together, and are so essentially one that neither of the two can be understood without the other. Apart from the Cross we should never have known God's love and learnt its depths of meaning; and apart from Agape Christ's path would not have led Him to the Cross. As surely as Paul will know nothing else but Jesus Christ and Him crucified, so he will not know of any other love than that which is bound up with Christ's Cross. The central point of Paul's teaching is the Agape of the Cross.

Of all the passages which show this union between Agape and the Cross, the classical passage is Rom. v. 6-10: "While we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will

From *Agape and Eros*, Part I, translated by A. G. Herbert, London, 1932, pp. 84-98. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and The Macmillan Company, New York.

one die: for peradventure for the good man some one would even dare to die. But God commendeth His own ἀγάπη towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through Him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life." Four points call for notice here.

(i.) When we ask how God's Agape is manifested, we are referred to the Cross of Christ. To all the various ways in which the Synoptic teaching sets forth the idea of Agape, Paul adds the one final word, the Cross. The death of Jesus on the Cross is the absolutely supreme manifestation of God's Agape. It is the same thought that we meet in 1 John iii. 16: "Hereby know we love, because He laid down His life for us." Had we never known the manifestation of love on the Cross, we might have known the meaning of love in general, but we should never have known the Christian meaning of love; we should never have known love in its highest and deepest meaning, God's own love, Agape. The testimony of the Cross is that Agape-love is a love which gives itself, pours itself out, even to the uttermost.

(ii.) The love manifested on the Cross is God's own love. God commends His love in this, that Christ died for us. Christ's work is God's own work, Christ's Agape is God's Agape. Since that redemptive act, we cannot speak properly of God's love without referring to the Cross of Christ, any more than we can speak of Christ's love shown in His death without seeing in it God's own love. The two are one: Agape is "the love of God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 39). God is the subject; God Himself was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself (2 Cor. v. 19). Paul gives to the words "all is of God" (verse 18) the fullest possible meaning; it is not we who make our way to God, but God who makes His Way to us. The Atonement does not mean primarily that we reconcile ourselves with Him; when the Corinthians are bidden to do this (verse 20), it is only because it has just been said that God has in Christ reconciled us with Himself. Agape is, then, God's Way to man.

(iii.) Above all, in the Cross the Divine love is seen to be spontaneous and uncaused. For a righteous man some one might even dare to die; there would be a cause and an explanation of the act. But for whom did Christ give His life? Not for the righteous, but for sinners. This point is emphasised three times over in this one passage (verses 6, 8, 10), and with four different expressions: He died for those who were weak, ungodly, sinners, and enemies.

(iv.) God's spontaneous and uncaused love is poured out, as we have seen, on sinners, who were unrighteous and unworthy of that love. But Paul presses the point yet further: Christ died for the ungodly, the godless, ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν. The point need not be over-pressed; but it is significant that this word finds its way in when Paul is seeking to express how completely "uncaused" God's love is. When we remember how great a part the bond of cultus and religious fellowship played in the life of the day,

it is clear that it was no light thing to say that Christ died for the adherents of other religions, those who worshipped strange gods or none at all.

The description of Agape and the Cross in Romans v. may be called the supreme expression of the idea of God's Agape. But the characteristic thing is that Paul does not present the idea as his own idea; he is simply interpreting the reality of that which had happened when Christ was crucified. For him *the fact* is primary: God has manifested His Agape in the self-giving of His Son. To the fact he constantly returns, to it he refers. Hence God's Agape is presented, not as an idea or ideal of love, but as the mightiest of realities, as the love that had actually given itself freely in sacrifice for those who were most deeply fallen and lost in sin.

He can also use sacrificial language in speaking of Christ's death: "walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God" (Eph. v. 2). The connection here made between Christ's Agape and the Cross means that sacrifice is interpreted in a wholly new sense, consistent with the new order of fellowship with God; the contrast between the new view of sacrifice and the old may serve as a measure of the revolution that has taken place. It would be possible to trace three stages in the development of the idea of man's offering to God in sacrifice. First, there is the sacrificial oblation in its common, concrete meaning; man offers something of his own as a gift at God's altar. At times men feel themselves constrained to offer the most precious thing that they have, in order to win God's favour. This, however, brings us almost to the second stage, in which it is seen that man must offer not merely something of his own, but something of himself. Gradually it is realized that God wants something more than the ordinary sacrifices: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice" (1 Sam. xv. 22). That which man offers is now obedience, righteousness, justice, mercy, love; these are pleasing to God. The idea of man's offering is now spiritualised; it has become personal and ethical. Yet, can man really stand with such an offering in the presence of the holy and righteous God? How can such an offering ever be free from the taint of pride and self-satisfaction, which could never be more out of place than when man stands before God? So we reach the third stage: "the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise" (Ps. li. 17). The only attitude which is fitting for man is that of humility. Here man has reached the limit of that which he can give to God. He has offered of his own, his dearest; he has offered his life-work, he has given himself in obedience to God's law of righteousness; and he has even offered up any claim that he could make for himself on the ground of his obedience. Yet after all there still remains a hidden something that is essentially alien to sacrifice; in reckoning his own humility as a way to fellowship with God, as entitling him to an imperishable value in God's sight, he is in truth not humble at all. Nietzsche has seen the point: "He who despises himself feels at the same time a certain respect for himself, as being a despiser of himself." In truth, however much the idea of sacrifice be spiritualised, its

various stages are only different phases of one and the same thing; there is no new principle involved, but only the old principle, that man's offering is a way by which man seeks to win God's favour. Throughout all three stages man is seeking to find a way to God. It might be said, from the Pauline point of view, that the second stage corresponds to the Way of Pharisaism, the third to that of the Anawim.

Paul sees that the third of these, no less than the second, has been wholly superseded by the Cross of Christ. From the Cross he has learnt that there is no way at all leading to God from man's side; but he has also learnt that, while all man-made sacrifices are thus set aside, wholly new possibilities in the idea of sacrifice have been opened up. At the Cross it is God, not man, who makes the sacrifice; for all is of God, and God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. *Sacrifice is no longer man's endeavour to win God's favour, but God's own Way to man.*

We have now seen how central a place the idea of Agape takes in Paul's thought. He has not merely taken over and continued the idea of Agape, but he has given the idea a great and important development, by connecting it with the death of Jesus on the Cross. The meaning of the Cross for Paul is bound up with the Divine Agape; the preaching of God's love and the preaching of Jesus Christ and Him crucified are one and the same thing. It is evident, therefore, that it is wholly false to set the Gospel of Jesus about God's fatherly love in opposition to Paul's Gospel *about* Christ and his theology of the Cross. *When Paul speaks of the Cross, he is speaking of God's fatherly love and nothing else;* and he never sets forth God's love as what Julicher would call "self-evident," but always expounds the conception as an amazing paradox.

And in truth it is altogether the same conception that is expressed in his doctrine of Justification. When Paul says that God justifies the sinner apart from the works of the Law, it is essentially the same idea as that given in the words of Jesus: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."

LOVE TO GOD

When Paul speaks of Agape in connection with the Cross, or with Justification, he is speaking of God's love, Christ's love, the love of God manifested in the death of His Son. But he can also speak of Agape in another connection: "love is the fulfilment of the Law." This is a love that is to be actualised in the Christian; and Paul, like Jesus, can sum up the whole Law in the commandment of love. But here we meet what appears to be a surprising change of view. Whereas, according to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus speaks of the double commandment of love to God and to one's neighbour, and love to God thus stands as the great commandment of the Law, with Paul the case is reversed; love to man seems to take the first place, and the whole Law can be summarised in the saying "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Rom. xiii. 9).

But this remarkable change is not confined to this one special application. It has long since been remarked by commentators that Paul speaks very rarely of Agape in the sense of man's love to God or to Christ.

Augustine, for whom love to God is the summary of all Christian duty, remarks with some surprise that when Paul uses the word "caritas" he nearly always means love to one's neighbour, and only very seldom love to God. Modern exegesis altogether endorses this old observation; it can even be questioned whether Paul can with certainty be said to speak of love to God at all, since the few passages which may be taken in this way are susceptible of other interpretations. But whatever answer be given to these exegetical questions, in any case there is no doubt about the general tendency of Paul's language. As Professor (now Archbishop) Eidem says: "That Paul so rarely uses the word love to express the attitude of man (as subject) towards God (as object) is the more surprising, when we remember how in the Old Testament the word is continually used to express the attitude of the faithful towards God. We cannot forget how the Great Commandment of love to God (Deut. vi. 5) had been recited daily by Paul from his childhood. It forms part of the Jewish Creed, the *Schma*, which was composed of the three passages, Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21, and Num. xv. 37-41. Nor can it well be doubted that Paul was acquainted with the affirmation both of primitive Christianity and of Jesus Himself, that love to God was the Great Commandment (Matt. xxii. 37, Mark xii. 30, 33, Luke x. 27.)."

It can, indeed, be no accident that Paul thus leaves on one side the idea of Agape when he is speaking of man's attitude towards God; and the matter must be one of principle. Elsewhere we found that the dependence of love to one's neighbour on love to God expresses a central principle of Christian ethics; yet it is not credible that in this matter Paul drops below the level of the Old Testament, in which love to God was already recognised to be the first and great commandment. There can be no doubt that the Pauline ethics are religious ethics from start to finish.

The answer is not far to seek. Actually Paul sets our love for our neighbour in direct relation, not with our love to God, but with God's love to us; and both this, and his unwillingness to speak of man as having Agape towards God, are the direct consequence of the root-idea of Agape, as he sets it forth. For if Agape is a love so utterly spontaneous and uncaused as the love which is manifested in the Cross of Christ, then the name Agape cannot fittingly be used to denote man's attitude towards God. In relation to God, man is never fully "spontaneous." Man's self-giving to God is no more than a response; at its best and highest, it is but a reflection of God's own love. It lacks all the essential marks of Agape; it is not spontaneous and it is not creative. It requires, therefore, a different name: not *ἀγάπη*, but *πίστις*.

Here, then, we have another point at which the idea of Agape in Paul shows a certain development, and a legitimate development, as compared with the idea in the Synoptic Gospels; and it comes at the point at which we noticed in the last chapter a concealed difficulty in the Gospel usage. God's love is above all spontaneous and uncaused, and no love that is not of this character can rightly be called Agape; yet the Synoptic Gospels speak of an Agape of man towards God. It might be inferred that man

has, after all, a certain independence in regard to God, so that the spontaneity of human Agape must limit the absoluteness of God's Agape. As we saw, this is not at all the intention of the Synoptic Gospels; the love of man to God, in the mouth of Jesus, is the acknowledgment of God's absolute sovereignty. It must further be remembered that the Synoptic tradition lacks the clearness of terminology which Paul introduced; the word Agape is not there definitely fixed as a technical term. But, in any case, this difficulty is in Paul completely overcome by his refusal to use the word Agape of man's attitude towards God. He reserves the term Agape for God's love to man; all is of God.

In this respect the idea as it is set forth in Paul is clearer than it is in the Synoptic Gospels. But this does not mean that Paul's teaching is in any way opposed to that of Jesus. He simply fixes the interpretation of Agape which Jesus Himself had given, not only in His teaching, but still more in His life and in His self-oblation to the death of the Cross. It is the Cross of Christ that compels Paul to refrain from speaking of an Agape of man towards God.

Nor, again, is Paul losing sight of the spiritual reality denoted by the phrase "love to God"; he is but giving it its right name, "faith." Faith includes in itself the whole self-devotion of love; but it emphasises the character of this love as response, as derivative love. Faith is a love to God that is receptive, not spontaneous.

MAN'S LOVE FOR HIS NEIGHBOUR

On the other hand, Paul is all the more unreserved in his use of the word Agape for the attitude of the Christian to his neighbour. The thought that love to man is the fulfilment of the Law occurs several times in Paul, and receives peculiar emphasis. The classical passage is Rom. xiii. 8-10: "He that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the Law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilment of the Law." Similarly he says in Gal. v. 14: "The whole Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

When Paul thus equates love to man with the whole demand of the Law, neglecting the traditional inclusion of love to God, this does not at all mean that he is making love towards man into a purely ethical precept, and separating it from its religious basis. On the contrary, he continually refers love towards man back to its basis in God's love to men. Human relations are to be based on Agape, because the fellowship of men with God is based on Agape. Thus he says in Eph. v. 1, 2: "Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children; and walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave Himself for us." The same principle has been applied in the preceding verse to Christian forgiveness: "forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you" (iv. 32); and it appears

often elsewhere, as in "Receive ye one another, even as Christ also received you, to the glory of God" (Rom. xv. 7).

But this point leads up to a new difficulty. The love which God has shown to us through the death of His Son is presented as so absolute, so utterly spontaneous and uncaused, that the term Agape is no longer felt to be suitable to express man's love to God, which can never be in the full sense spontaneous and creative, and Paul does not usually so use it. But then we must ask: Ought he not to reserve the name Agape exclusively for God's love or Christ's love? How can he use it for the Christian's love for his neighbour? Surely he ought to find a new name in this case also, since no human love can be set on a level with God's creative love.

The answer may be expected to throw light on the religious basis of the Pauline ethics; yet it is not the answer which might be anticipated by those who approach the study of Paul with Lutheran antecedents, and who rightly feel that the emphasis which Paul lays on faith shows that Luther's outlook is closely related to that of Paul. They might expect to find that in Paul the ethical life of the Christian, including his love to his neighbour, is referred to faith as its religious basis. But this expectation is only in part verified; the idea does indeed occur in Gal. v. 6, "faith working through love," but this is almost the only passage which can be appealed to with certainty. Paul's actual answer, however, shows that the religious basis of his ethics is deeper than it would have been if he had consistently connected love with faith. He treats the ethical life of the Christian as the direct expression of God's or Christ's Agape; "the love of Christ constraineth us" (2 Cor. v. 14).

This is the reason why Paul can use the name Agape for the love of the Christian for his neighbour. It is not really man, but God, who is the subject of this love—God, the spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, the Agape of Christ, are the terms that are used. Between Christ and the Christian there is a spiritual fellowship, such as Paul describes in Gal. ii. 20: "I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me"; and the basis of this fellowship is, that he "loved me and gave Himself for me." Thus the Agape of the Christian is Christ's Agape in him. God's Agape can be described, almost realistically, as "shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us" (Rom. v. 5); it forms the true substance of the life of the Christian, and in his social life it is freely given to others. He has nothing of his own to give; the love which he shows to his neighbour is God's Agape in him.

Hence the use of the term Agape to describe the love of the Christian for men means that *in this case also Agape denotes God's own love*. It is not that God's love for man and man's love for his neighbour are two different things; they are one thing. Agape is used to denote God's love, not human love; God's love present in the Christian heart. The term faith would have been less suitable to describe the life of Agape, because faith implies receptivity and response. Paul traces this Agape back to its original source in God's own Agape. It is not that *I* have in *my* religious life the true basis for *my* ethical life; were it so, it would appear that *I* should still

remain in myself, and develop my ethical potentialities. Paul's religion and Paul's ethics are theocentric altogether: All is of God, who has reconciled us with Himself through Christ; and whoever is in Christ is a new creature, living not unto himself or for himself (2 Cor. v. 15 f.), but unto Christ.

This brings us to one more characteristic of the Pauline conception of Agape: its opposition to all that can be called self-love. We saw in the last chapter how the attempt can be made to distinguish between a right and a wrong self-love, and to present the former as a third species of Christian love, by the side of love to God and love to man, and we saw that this self-love cannot rightly be found in the Gospel command. It is equally alien to the mind of Paul. "The love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. viii. 39) is the ground for all that can rightly be called Agape, and the characteristic of this love is just self-giving; it is therefore the direct opposite of the love which is desire, which seeks something for the self. Naturally, then, we find, in 1 Cor. xiii. 5, that Agape "seeketh not its own"; this is the necessary consequence of the theocentric nature of Agape. Agape pronounces judgment on all life that centres round the ego and its interests; hence Paul condemns those who seek their own things, not the things of Jesus Christ (Phil. ii. 21). When Agape is shed abroad in human hearts, those hearts gain thereby a new centre; Christ lives in them; they live not for themselves, but for Him who died for them and rose again. As Christ pleased not Himself, we also ought not to please ourselves, but to please our neighbour for that which is God, unto edifying (Rom. xv. 1-3).

When in such passages as these Paul contrasts self-love and love of others, he is not condemning only the "lower self-love" or the natural tendency to self-assertion, but all self-love, even in its most "spiritual" forms. Nothing is more alien to his mind than to encourage such a spiritual self-love, as though the self must first secure its own spiritual well-being, and then learn to show love to others. Christian love is to be prepared to give up even spiritual benefits and advantages. In 1 Cor. vii. we find that Paul regards the celibate life as in itself higher and better than the married life; yet the Christian may be required by Agape to abstain from the higher way for the sake of his spouse. Constrained by Agape, Paul can even declare himself willing to be anathema from Christ for the sake of his kinsmen according to the flesh, if thereby they might be saved (Rom. ix. 3).

To sum up: Agape in the Pauline teaching is a singularly clear and consistent conception, altogether theocentric. All is of God, nothing of man. While in all other religions it is man who offers sacrifice, and God who receives it, here the sacrifice is made by God himself; in infinite Agape-love He sends His Son, who freely gives Himself for men, who are weak, ungodly, sinners, and enemies. At this point the righteousness of the Law is no help, but a hindrance, because it ties man to that which is his own, and prevents him from subjecting himself to the righteousness of God (Rom. x. 3); to seek to be justified by the Law is to fall away from Grace (Gal. v. 4). But when, through faith, man's heart is opened up for God's action, God's Agape is shed abroad there through the Holy Spirit, and the

basis is thereby laid for the new, Spirit-given, Agape-life, in which the real agent is no longer the ego, but God, or Christ, or God's Agape, or Christ's Spirit. Constrained by the Agape of Christ, or led by the Spirit (Gal. v. 18), the Christian fulfils God's work, and bears the fruits of the Spirit; and of the fruits of the Spirit the first is Agape. Thus Agape has both the first and the last word.

THE PAULINE IDEA OF FAITH

William H. P. Hatch

EVEN THE CASUAL READER of the New Testament is impressed with the prominence which the ideas of faith and believing have in the epistles of Paul, and this impression is confirmed by a glance at the Greek concordance of Moulton and Geden. In this study we are interested in ideas rather than in words; but since we can learn the Apostle's ideas only through his use of words, we must first examine carefully the words which relate to faith and believing in his letters. They are six in number.

The following table will show the use of this group of words in the ten genuine epistles:

	πίστις	πιστεύειν	πιστός	ἀπιστία	ἀπιστεῖν	ἄπιστος
1 Thess.	8	5	1			
2 Thess.	5	4	1			
Gal.	22	4	1			
1 Cor.	7	9	5			11
2 Cor.	7	2	2			3
Rom.	40	21		4	1	
Phm.	2					
Col.	5		4			
Eph.	8	2	2			
Phil.	5	1				
	109	48	16	4	1	14

It is not necessary to give here the various shades of meaning which these words have, for they can readily be learned from any lexicon of the New Testament or from commentaries. But it is important to note that four distinct ideas are denoted by *πίστις* in Paul—(1) *conviction* or *belief*; (2) *trust*; (3) *faith*; and (4) *faithfulness* or *fidelity*. In like manner the verb *πιστεύειν* means: (1) *to be convinced* or *to believe*; (2) *to trust*; (3) *to have faith*; and (4) *to entrust*.

It is a significant fact that Paul uses *πίστις* only twice in the sense of faithfulness—once as an attribute of God and once as a Christian virtue. The Jews, according to the Apostle, had forfeited their distinctive advantage by not believing in Christ; but yet it would be the height of unreason to suppose that their unbelief could bring to naught God's faithfulness to his promises. Again, in the hortatory part of the Epistle to the Galatians Paul

⁴ From *The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion*, Cambridge, 1917, pp. 31-66. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Harvard University Press.

draws up a list of vices called "the works of the flesh"; and then he proceeds to give a corresponding catalogue of virtues, which he designates "the fruit of the Spirit." Among the latter he mentions *πίστις*, which in view of the context must mean faithfulness, or honesty in one's dealings with one's fellows. The Apostle believed that love was the fulfilment of the law of Moses, and that love sprang from faith. The law was thus superseded for him as the fundamental and all-sufficient rule of life, and with it of course went the fidelity to it by which he had been actuated as a Pharisee. This fact accounts in large measure for the infrequency of the idea of faithfulness in the letters of Paul.

The active meaning of *πίστις*, which was developed out of the ideas of belief and trust, predominates in the epistles of Paul, and in its specifically Pauline sense it gives character to his conception of Christianity. Though faith, as we shall see presently, has been foreordained by God, it begins with the preaching and receptive hearing of the gospel; but it is by no means solely the work of man, for it is dependent upon the power of God. In other words, the inception of the converts' faith is due to the action of a divine power working upon them through human agents; and from this point of view the missionaries' message is called "the word of God" or "the gospel of God," and "the word of Christ" or "the gospel of Christ." Paul also speaks of it as "the word of the cross," "the word of reconciliation," "the word of truth," and "the word of life"; and in the Epistle to the Ephesians it is termed, with reference to its soteriological effect, "the gospel of your salvation." If the hearers do not believe, the preachers' efforts are in vain and the gospel as "a power of God unto salvation" is wholly ineffective; but if, on the other hand, they do believe that Christ died for their sins and that God raised him from the dead, they can be saved and the divine purpose accomplished. Hence towards the end of his life Paul hoped to hear that his Philippian friends were striving together in mutual fellowship and with unanimity in the interest of faith in the gospel, being affrighted in nothing by their adversaries.

It might perhaps be supposed that faith is merely a conviction concerning certain alleged facts or the intellectual acceptance of the gospel message; and there are a few passages in which the verb *πιστεύειν* is used in reference to a purely intellectual act. In these cases believing is equivalent to being convinced or persuaded that something is true, as when the Apostle declares in the Epistles to the Romans, "But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." But faith is from the beginning much more than belief or conviction, for it involves the feelings and the will as well as the intellect. Trust and loyalty are included in it. If faith were purely intellectual, it might conceivably be the starting-point of a new and better life, but it never could be the basic and permanent principle of a mystical type of religion like the Pauline conception of Christianity.

Faith is of divine origin and comes from above; for long before the work of evangelization began and back of it in his eternal plan God chose believers unto salvation by that sanctification of life which springs from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and by faith in the truth of the gospel.

Faith indeed, like certain other distinctive features of the Christian's life, is a gift of God, who imparts it to each believer in such measure as he wills. Inasmuch as the missionaries' word is really God's word and Christ speaks in them, Paul can write to the Corinthians as follows: "My word and my preaching were not in persuasive words of (worldly) wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith might not be dependent upon the wisdom of men, but upon the power of God." The preachers are simply the instruments which God, or Christ, or the Spirit employs in order that men may hear and believe. At the end of the Epistle to the Ephesians the Apostle wishes the brethren spiritual "peace and love along with faith from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," just as grace and peace nearly always have this double source in the salutations of the Pauline epistles. Hence faith is not only divinely foreordained as a part of God's providential plan; it is also of divine origin, so that all thought of personal merit or superiority on the part of the believer is excluded. Whatever measure of faith a Christian possesses is due solely to grace. Paul tells the Romans that even the gift of inspired utterance (*προφητεία*) is to be exercised according to the proportion or measure of faith which the prophet has received from God.

Faith is the primary and fundamental matter, because without it the gospel is not able to save, and upon it, as we shall see, depends everything that is connected with the Christian life—membership in the community of believers, mystical fellowship with Christ, and all the blessings comprised under the name of salvation. Faith is so essential and characteristic an element of the Christian life that Paul frequently speaks of Christians as believers (*οἱ πιστεύοντες* or *οἱ πιστοί*) without specifying the nature or object of their faith—a fact which shows that Christianity, however it may have been conceived and presented at other periods of its history, was for the Apostle a religion based on faith. In like manner the verb *πιστεύειν* means to be a Christian, or in the aorist to become a Christian, no less than thirteen times in the letters of Paul. Thus, for example, he writes to the brethren in Rome, "For now is our salvation nearer than when we became Christians (*ἐπιστευσάμεν*)."

In the Old Testament and in the discourses of Jesus, as we have already seen, the object of trust is always God. To him, and to him alone, the heart of the pious went out in trust; and Abraham's faith or trust in Jahveh is typical of that of his race. Paul once uses *πίστις* of the faith or belief of the Thessalonians as converts to Christianity, and here it is directed towards God, who had elected them to it. By implication it is contrasted with their former belief in pagan divinities. Although ethical and religious consequences of the greatest importance were involved in the Thessalonians' change of belief, the dominant note in the phrase "faith towards God" here is intellectual.

But, as has been pointed out above, the primitive disciples who assembled in Jerusalem after the death and resurrection of their Master recognized him as Lord and Messiah; and this conviction or belief concerning him, which was the corner-stone of the Palestinian church, easily passed over

into faith or trust in Jesus. So, too, in the epistles of Paul faith is nearly always related to Christ; but in this case it is something more than belief or trust in him as Lord or Messiah. For the Apostle faith is the basic principle of Christianity and the distinguishing characteristic of Christians; and in order to understand its nature we must start from the Pauline view of the Christian life, for it is solely by virtue of faith that a person becomes and remains a Christian.

To be a Christian in Paul's sense of the term is to be "in Christ," i.e. to be in mystical fellowship with him, and Christ is identified with the divine Spirit. The relation expressed by this characteristically Pauline phrase, which is new only in so far as Christ is the medium in which the fellowship is realized, is conceived in a thoroughly realistic and mystical way. The "pneumatic" Christ is the atmosphere or element in which the believer lives, and he in turn is possessed, controlled, and transformed by it. The new air, charged, as it were, with divine power, produces in him a new kind of life, and under its influence he becomes a "new creature" and has the mind of Christ. Therefore he ought not to be conformed to this age, which the Apostle looks upon as evil and under the control of Satan, but rather to be transformed inwardly by the renovating action of the Holy Spirit upon his mind (*νοῦς*). Also the brethren who have died are still in Christ, for they do not cease to be Christians at death, and to be a Christian is to be in Christ. Christ conceived as Spirit is the environment of the believer's life, the atmosphere or element in which he lives, but he is quite distinct from Christ. The fundamental ideas are control by the divine Spirit and divinization ("pneumatization")—two categories which Paul allows to remain unadjusted to each other. To become "pneumatic" is to become divine, just as Christ is divine; but it is not to become identified with Christ or to lose one's own identity in him. Nor does divinization militate against the ethical significance ascribed to the operation of the Spirit. The *πνευματικός* differs from the *σαρκικός* in that he is under divine control and is himself divine in nature. It can also be said that Christ, or the Spirit, or even God dwells in the Christian—three divine powers which are in this respect alike in operation; and we must not overlook the fact that Paul, like the modern pragmatist, is more interested in the practical working of the divine than in its abstract nature.

According to some modern scholars, Paul believed that a person was brought into mystical fellowship with Christ by means of baptism, which in that case must have been thought of as working in some sense *ex opere operato*. In other words, this early Christian institution was of a truly sacramental or magical character, like the ablutions practised in some of the mystery cults. A few passages in the Apostle's letters, when taken by themselves, seem to warrant the conclusion that the writer regarded baptism as the means through which one entered into fellowship with Christ. Thus Paul tells the Christians of Galatia that as many of them as were baptized into Christ had put on Christ, just as one puts on a garment. But on the other hand the Apostle uses the aorist of the verb *πρωτεύειν* six times

absolutely and once with *eis Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν* in the sense of becoming a Christian, as if faith were the paramount factor at the beginning of the Christian life; and this fact, as well as the passages referred to above, must be kept in mind. The truth is that faith and baptism go together, as is clear from the following passage in the letter to the Galatians: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in the sphere of Christ Jesus; for as many of you as were baptized into Christ, put on Christ." The two together constitute a single act, of which faith is the subjective and baptism the objective side. Paul believed it was his mission to preach the gospel and produce faith, and so he ordinarily left to others the work of baptizing the converts; but we must not suppose on this account that he regarded the latter lightly or with indifference. Faith is the means by which one receives the Spirit and enters into mystical fellowship with the "pneumatic" Christ; and, as we shall see later, it is itself a mystical state. Baptism, being the objective aspect of the process by which the mystical relationship is established, differs from a mere rite or symbol in that it is endowed with a certain mystical character.

We must not, however, suppose that faith is confined to the beginning of the Christian life—that its work is over when the relationship between the believer and Christ has once been established. Faith is the means or channel through which Christ abides in the hearts of Christians; and through faith they enjoy the high privilege of being sons of God in the sphere of Christ Jesus, thus realizing in the present age the adoption to which God has in love predestinated them through Jesus Christ, and which is to have its consummation in the age following the *parousia* of the Lord. The mystical relationship with Christ, as we have seen, is inaugurated through faith, and faith is necessary for its continuance. In other words, the Christian's faith is permanent. Indeed, according to the Apostle, all that really counts in the sphere of Christ Jesus is faith working through love as its outward and visible expression.

— Faith is also the mystical state in which Christians live; and it is necessary for them to continue in it, if they are to be presented holy and blameless and unreprouable before God. Hence Paul exhorts the Corinthians to stand firm and steadfast in faith; and again in that sharp and bitter letter to the same church, which forms part of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he charges them to try themselves to see if they really are in faith (*ἐν τῇ πίστει*), because their treatment of him makes it seem as if they were no longer Christians. The writer might have expressed substantially the same idea by the familiar phrase "in Christ." Hence "to be in faith" (*ἐν τῇ πίστει εἶναι*) is practically equivalent to the more common expression "to be in Christ" (*ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι*), and it means to be in a state of mystical fellowship with him. Paul not infrequently speaks of Christians simply as "the believers" (*οἱ πιστεύοντες* or *οἱ πιστοί*).

How did a mystical connotation get attached to the idea of faith, which in primitive Christian circles was wholly devoid of anything of the sort? In the writings of Philo of Alexandria faith or trust in God is tinged

with mysticism, which in all probability was derived from the religious teaching of the Stoics; for Stoicism was one of the principal elements out of which the syncretistic philosophy of Philo was compounded. But the resemblance between the Alexandrian thinker and Paul in this matter is only superficial; for the mysticism connected with the latter's idea of faith did not come from Stoicism in particular, nor was it borrowed from Philo, with whose thought the Apostle, so far as we know, was not acquainted. The religious atmosphere of the Graeco-Roman world was laden with mysticism; and Paul of Tarsus was so thoroughly *en rapport* with his environment that this element of it found its way into his conception of Christianity and his idea of faith, and to each of them it gave a fundamentally mystical character.

We now come to the question concerning the nature of faith in Paul. Is it emotional, or intellectual, or ethical? Or does it involve all of these forms of psychical life? Enough has already been said about the divine origin and permanent character of faith, as well as its fundamental importance in the Pauline conception of Christianity, to show that it is not merely emotional nor purely intellectual. Both the feelings and the intellect have their parts to play in the preliminary process of conversion; but even in the primary act of accepting the gospel message the will is an important factor, as we learn from the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. Faith completely revolutionizes the life of the believer and makes him literally a "new creature" in Christ. The work of faith, as we shall see presently, is love, which is the fulfilment of the law; and therefore ultimately it is faith that makes it possible for the Christian to achieve the ethical ideal. In the Roman church the "strong" brethren ate all things without being troubled by conscientious scruples, whereas the "weak" abstained from meat and ate only vegetables. The Apostle explains and justifies this difference of practice on the ground of faith, which raises the "strong" brother above such morally indifferent matters and gives him independence and freedom. Such a Christian, says he, "has faith to eat all things"; and he even goes so far as to say that every act which does not proceed from faith is sin. On the one hand faith, provided it is mature and strong, frees the believer from the obligation of conforming to meaningless rules; while on the other it gives him confidence in ordering his conduct in a free and independent manner. Religion and moral excellence in Paul both rest upon faith, and hence they stand in the closest and most intimate relation to each other.

Although faith is of divine origin and a gift of God, nevertheless it is not at first perfect or complete. There is room for it to grow in strength and power, and apparently this growth may be indefinite. For after the Corinthians had been living the Christian life for some time, Paul expresses the hope that with the growth of their faith they may come to entertain a more just opinion of him, so that he may extend his missionary work to other fields. On the other hand concerning the Thessalonians he feels that he ought to thank God continually for the exceedingly great growth of his converts' faith; for the Spirit's control over their lives has become greater,

and in fellowship with Christ they have acquired a fuller and deeper knowledge of God. The "strong" brethren in the Roman community were also Christians of mature and robust faith. Faith might grow in depth and power, as it clearly had in the case of the Thessalonians and some of the believers in Rome. Such growth indeed was the normal result of living in Christ, and was to be expected in the case of all Christians.

Faith, which is meted out by God to each individual member of the church in such a measure as he wills, is a social force of great power and value. Believers possess it in varying degrees, but all have it in some measure, inasmuch as all are in Christ and have the Holy Spirit; and as there is one body, one Spirit, and one Lord, so there is also one faith, by which all Christians are bound together in fellowship. Whatever differences in race, social status, or sex existed among them and kept them apart before their conversion are forever abolished by their fellowship in Christ through faith, and in him they are all one; and by virtue of their common faith they are brethren in a sense far transcending that of natural or racial kinship. Hence Paul exhorts the Galatians to do good to all, but especially to those who are fellow members of the household of faith. Ideally at least Christians are bound together by love, which is the principal product of faith in the sphere of practical life and the "bond of perfection" among them. In other words, the saints are all in Christ through faith, or in faith, and it unites them in fellowship with one another. The church thus constituted is the new "Israel of God," which has inherited the promises of Jahveh to the chosen people; and it is also the "body of Christ," who is its divinely appointed head and with whom it is in vital union. Through faith believers are incorporated into this living organism, and only by continuing in it can one remain a member of the body. Such faith made of the Christians a distinct social group, which was conscious of its separateness from the world and of its own solidarity, and in which the obligations of brotherhood were vitalized and reinforced by a common principle of religion.

The love of God or Christ for men is a fundamental and controlling idea in Paul, and to love (*ἀγάπη*) he gives the first place among Christian virtues. It is a fruit of the indwelling Spirit, and consequently it cannot be had without faith; and it is also the greatest of the Christian graces, for it excels the most striking of the charismatic gifts and is superior even to faith and hope. Moreover, the Apostle believes that love will remain over unchanged into the age that is to be inaugurated at the *parousia* of Christ. Prophecy, speaking with tongues, and knowledge are destined to pass away with the present age, but it is inconceivable that love should come to an end or reach its fulfilment at the advent of the Lord. Furthermore, faith works through love, or perhaps is made operative through love, which is regarded as the work of faith *par excellence*; and in the Epistle to the Romans Paul sums up the law on its ethical side in the command to love one's neighbor as oneself, and draws the conclusion that love is the fulfilment of the law. Love indeed is his leading ethical word. Since love springs from faith, the justice and goodness required by the law are attainable by

anyone who has faith, which is thus the source of social morality. As it is necessary for Christians to continue steadfast in faith, so also, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, Paul will have them "rooted and grounded in love," through which faith works or becomes operative; and love, as we have seen, is the bond of perfection by which believers are bound together. In this respect love is the practical expression of the faith which makes them one in Christ. So paramount indeed is love that the Apostle solemnly exhorts his Thessalonian converts, in view of the approaching *parousia* of the Lord, to be sober, "having put on the breastplate of faith and love"; and in his second letter to them, which was probably written only a few weeks after the first, he tells them of his gratitude to God for the growth of their faith and the increase of their love.

The various virtues with which the lives of Christians were adorned, are regarded by Paul as resulting from faith or the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It will suffice to mention the following: endurance (*ὑπομονή*), peace (*εἰρήνη*), forbearance (*μακροθυμία*), kindness (*χρηστότης*), goodness (*ἀγαθωσύνη*), faithfulness (*πίστις*), gentleness (*πραΐτης*), and self-control (*ἐγκράτεια*). The last seven of these the Apostle calls "the fruit of the Spirit," i.e. of the divine power which dwells in believers; but they are also due to love, because it is only through the latter that Christians receive the Spirit.

Hope (*ἐλπίς*) is often mentioned by Paul in his letters, and sometimes in conjunction with faith and love—a fact which leads one to believe that he was wont to group these three together in his presentation of the gospel. The object of the Christian's hope is salvation, or glory in the age to be inaugurated at the *parousia*, or even Christ himself. In other words, the believer's "good hope," which non-believers do not have, is a confident expectation of future well-being or happiness, and it is his by virtue of the fact that Christ is in him. Ultimately, therefore, like everything else connected with the Christian life, hope springs from faith. Its fruition is of course in the future, but it is itself a present possession of believers; and inasmuch as it has salvation as its object and is sure to be realized in the coming age, it is the source of their endurance under trial and persecution. Finally, just as *ἡ πίστις* after the time of Paul came to mean the content or substance of Christian teaching, so *ἐλπίς* is sometimes used by the Apostle in a concrete or objective sense. Thus in the letter to the Galatians he speaks of the "hope of justification," i.e. the hope which is inspired by the believer's sense of being justified or forgiven; and again, in writing to the Colossians, he reminds them of "the hope that is laid up for you in the heavens."

Along with hope goes joy (*χαρά*)—no passing exhilaration, but an ardent and buoyant happiness that continues and makes its possessor cheerful amid the hardships and trials of life. Ultimately, like peace, it comes from God; but it springs directly from faith, because its immediate cause is the Christian's sense of justification or forgiveness. Joy is a permanent possession of believers and a characteristic mark of the Christian life, and so it is sometimes attributed to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in Christians; but

inasmuch as faith is the means through which they receive the Spirit, joy is also a product of faith.

Paul mentions *πίστις* among the charismatic gifts apportioned to various members of the Corinthian community. Here, however, the word is used in a special sense. . . . For faith in this passage is not the possession of all Christians or the distinctive mark of the Christian life, but is rather one among several manifestations of the Spirit and a particular endowment of certain individuals. It is given in the sphere of the Spirit, and is that species of faith or trust which enables its possessor to accomplish extraordinary or humanly impossible feats. Like the Christian life in general, it is under the control of the Holy Spirit, and, being a divine gift and a manifestation of the Spirit, it is of course not to be lightly esteemed. Nevertheless, the charisma of faith is not to be a permanent possession of the believer, like faith in the larger sense, hope, and love; but, along with the lesser "pneumatic" endowments, it is destined to pass away at the *parousia* of Christ. Our study shows conclusively that for the Apostle Paul faith in the larger sense of the word is the basic principle of religion and the source of moral excellence. For it is only through faith that one can become a Christian, receive the Holy Spirit, and live in mystical fellowship with Christ; indeed, faith is itself the mystical state in which the believer lives. So, too, it is the sole means whereby one can experience justification or forgiveness in the present age or be saved at the *parousia* of the Lord; and through faith come also the hope of salvation and the joy inspired by justification. Moreover, since love and all the other virtues which give to the Christian life its peculiar moral worth spring from faith, the latter is also the root or source of the believer's moral excellence. In a word, faith is for Paul the fundamental principle of the Christian life; and hence he sometimes speaks of Christians as being "of faith" (*ἐκ πίστεως*) in contrast to the Jews, who are "of the law" (*ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*). Abraham is the forefather of the latter according to the flesh; but the former are his sons and his seed by virtue of faith, so that they are the inheritors of the divine promise and blessing.

In spite of the obvious difficulties involved in any such undertaking, we must now attempt a definition of Paul's idea of faith on the basis of our examination of it. Faith, regarded as the acceptance of the word of God or Christ, is the convert's response to the gospel message under the influence of a divine power working in and through the missionaries, and hence faith is of divine origin. It is given to each individual by God in such measure as he wills. Faith is at once belief, trust, and loyalty—the means whereby the believer receives the Spirit, and enters into and continues in mystical fellowship with Christ. Indeed, it is itself the mystical state in which the Christian lives, and to it are due his spiritual blessings and the virtues which are characteristic of his life. Thus for the Apostle faith is the basic principle of religion and the source of moral excellence.

We have now described the Pauline idea of faith in full. It is clear that it was developed out of trust in Jahveh, which, as we have seen, was the

root of Hebrew and Jewish piety. Everywhere and always in Israelitish religion trust in Jahveh meant confidence in or reliance upon him as a personal being, and it was essentially the same for Jesus of Nazareth and his disciples. In Paul, however, as has been pointed out, *πίστις* is very different from trust. The difference is due in part to the fact that the Apostle, being emancipated from the Mosaic law after his conversion, made faith at once the basic principle of religion and the source of moral excellence, and in part also to the mysticism which he imported into the idea. Paul's mysticism seems to have been derived from no one source in particular, as from Philo or some one of the mystery cults. It was rather absorbed, in a perfectly natural and partly unconscious way, from his Graeco-Roman environment, in which mysticism was a very prominent and important factor. Thus in the Pauline idea of faith Hebraic and Hellenistic elements are commingled in such a way that a novel result is produced—a contribution to the philosophy of religion whose significance it is impossible to overestimate.

.

Part V

MODERN EVALUATIONS OF PAUL

[DIFFICULTIES IN PAUL'S RELIGION]

Ernest F. Scott

WHY is it that the plain man is unmoved by a simpler gospel, but responds to the message of Paul, which perplexes even the trained theologian? The answer is that Paul's interpretation is simpler in its essence than those which are offered in its place. It is indeed associated with a number of doctrines which at this distance of time have grown obscure and often doubtful; but these for the most part can be disregarded. There is a truth at the centre of it which every one can recognise, and which is vital in all religion. Man in his helplessness can throw himself on God and find forgiveness and new life. Paul had realised this truth with such intensity that he was able to enforce it, as no other teacher has done, on the minds of others.

So it may fairly be claimed that Paulinism, rightly understood, is no mere type of Christianity but is the religion itself, in its ultimate meaning. Paul never doubts that this is so. He calls himself the ambassador of Christ. He believes that Christ is speaking with his voice. He can say "be followers of me, as I am of Christ." Yet it has always been recognised that the message of Paul is peculiarly his own. In his lifetime he was regarded as a schismatic, and even his own converts were half doubtful of him. After his death he stood out as the greatest of the Apostles and the pattern for all Christian men, but while his writings were diligently read they had little influence on the general thought of the church. He was allowed a place by himself, and the later theologians carried on their work apart from him. His teaching has never been fully accepted. There have been those in every age who said "we are of Paul," but at best they have laid hold on some of his ideas and magnified them, and have quietly discarded all the rest. There must be reasons why the Pauline teaching has never commended itself to the church at large, and they are not hard to discover.

For one thing, the very truth and greatness of Paul's message have stood in its way. He asserted the Christian demand in its full extent, without compromise. He brought to light what was finally involved in the new gospel. Few men, if any, have been able to go the whole length with Paul, for the very reason that they cannot fully accept Christianity itself. Those elements of Paul which the church has incorporated in its creeds are for the most part those which lie on the circumference, and which belong not to Paul's own religion but to his age. The difficulty has always been with the essential Paulinism, which lies behind the doctrinal structure and

which Paul had received not from men but by revelation of Jesus Christ. This was his true religion, and when we consider its cardinal principles we can well understand why the church has held aloof from Paul.

(1) In the first place, he grounded his teaching in the conception of grace, with its correlative that man's attitude to God must be one of faith. Before he became a Christian he had assumed, like others, that God was a task-master who paid strictly for service done. This idea was worked out most fully in Judaism, but was taken for granted in all religions. It was, indeed, the natural assumption. Man finds, in his common experience, that he only receives what he has worked for. This is the rule that obtains everywhere, and since the world's order appears to be founded on it must we not conclude that it also holds good in our relation to God? It was revealed to Paul, by his knowledge of Christ, that God does not deal with men according to that rule. He is the infinite Giver, who by His own grace, apart from our deserving, bestows on us all the things that are most worth having. As He sends rain and sunshine on the evil and the good, so He offers His salvation; and the part of man is simply to open his heart to the bounty of God, aware that he has nothing of his own and must be willing to receive. This attitude of receptivity, of utter self-surrender to God, is what Paul calls faith, as contrasted with all previous trust in our own righteousness. In his anti-legal polemic, which is apt to impress us now as wearisome and academical, he is trying to drive home a simple religious truth. God does not bargain with us but gives freely, and the Cross is the eternal symbol of the divine grace. Faith is the act in which we respond to it, and by faith alone can we be saved. This is a message which men can never bring themselves wholeheartedly to believe. They cannot rid themselves of the old assumption that from God, as from their fellow-men they can receive nothing but what they have earned. In every creed of the church there is some effort to adjust Paul's conception to that other which he threw aside.

(2) Closely related to his doctrine of grace and faith is that of the Spirit. He had learned, as part of his revelation, that on those who trust Him God bestows a divine power. The whole Christian life, to Paul, is life in the Spirit. By nature we are children of this world, and are subject to all its limitations, but as Christians we are endowed with an energy from a higher world, and in the strength of it can do what seems impossible. The mind is illuminated with a new kind of knowledge; the will is renewed and all moral achievement is brought within our reach. Paul was a Hellenist, and fell heir to the Hellenistic idea that man's weakness is due to his earthly nature, which must undergo a radical change. His teaching is affected by this idea, and he appears to think of a heavenly essence, mingling with the earthly substance and transmuting it. To this extent his conception of the Spirit is entangled with a magical theory, more Pagan than Christian. But apart from the doctrinal frame-work he was not indebted for his belief to any suggestions, either from Jewish or Pagan thought. From the moment of his conversion he had realised that something which was other than himself had taken possession of him. His life was controlled by a higher

power to which he yielded himself without reserve. At this point also the church has found it necessary to part company with Paul. His doctrine of the Spirit has been formally preserved, but has been qualified, and to a great extent neutralised. It has proved impossible even for the most ardent souls to commit themselves wholly to the Spirit, and room has been made, under various disguises, for the old authority of the Law.

(3) Again, Paul was conscious that in some mysterious way he was now united with Christ, and here, perhaps, we touch on the conception which is most intimately Pauline. It pervades his whole religion, and marks its intensely personal character. All Christians can join in the confession "Jesus is Lord," but with Paul this loyalty to Christ merges in a sense of actual identity. He thinks of Christ as the inner principle of his own being. Here again it is possible to discern the Hellenistic influence at work in Paul's expression of his belief. The aim of the prevailing cults was to bring the worshipper into union with his divinity. When the rites of his initiation were completed he was divested of his garment and clothed with another, in token of the divine nature with which he was now endued. Paul would seem at times to fall back on similar ideas. He speaks of the convert as rising from baptism into newness of life, and as casting off the old man and putting on the Lord Jesus Christ. But he is only seeking to describe, in the religious language of his time, a profoundly Christian experience. Nothing is more remarkable in the writings of Paul than the note of passion which breaks in of its own accord whenever he speaks of his devotion to Christ. He may be in the middle of an abstract argument, but all at once he soars into rapture. It is absurd to explain this passion from an effort to conform Christian ideas to those of the Pagan cults. The very mark of it is its perfect spontaneity. It is not due to any outside influence but springs out of that element in Paul's religion which is most purely Christian. He is over-mastered by his love of Christ. He speaks of himself as the "slave" of this Lord, who owns him soul and body. And as always happens in a great affection he has a sense of oneness with the object of his love. Christ is not some one other than the man Paul but in some mysterious way is his more essential self. The phrase which occurs most frequently in the writings of Paul is the mystical "in Christ." It escapes from him in all manner of connections, often when he is speaking of quite ordinary things, and bears witness to a mood which was habitual with him, giving direction to everything he did and thought. The term Paulinism has come to be used vaguely, and covers a great deal which was the common property of Gentile Christianity, but we can be sure that whenever he tells us of that union of his own being with that of Christ, we hear the authentic voice of Paul.

(4) Again, Christianity is for Paul the religion of liberty. "Christ has made you free"; this idea is ever and again repeated in different words, and may almost be taken as the central motive of Paul's message. He thinks of the Christian as released from all earthly bonds; to his own Master he stands or falls; he judges all things but is himself judged by no man. On one memorable occasion Paul made his appeal to Caesar. Amidst all his earlier troubles he had carried with him the proud consciousness that he was

a Roman citizen, and in an extremity could defy any lower tribunal and demand a sentence from Caesar himself. This privilege he had forborne to use, but in the end, tired out by the law's delays he fell back on it, with disastrous consequences. It is one of the ironies of life that a man's worst calamities result, almost always, from his advantages, and this was the experience of Paul. His appeal to Caesar proved a delusion, but as a Christian he had a higher privilege which he was using constantly. From all human judgments he could appeal to that of Christ, and in this assurance he passed through the world with a splendid sense of immunity. He sat loose to all tradition and opinion, and went fearlessly on his own way. In the course of his Epistle he has occasion to answer many questions, and never fails to lift them to a higher plane and to make his decision by the one standard of the mind of Christ. It is not too much to say that Paul was the first man in history who was really free. There can, indeed, be no true liberty which is not founded on Paul's conception of man as a spiritual being, who lives in this material world but is subject to another, and who cannot, therefore, accept any earthly authority as final.

The idea of Christianity as the religion of freedom was, in the full extent, peculiar to Paul,—so much so that the church has never risen to the height of it. This was the chief cause of the hostility which followed him in his lifetime. He had declared that all shackles were now removed, and even his best converts were afraid to go with him beyond a certain point. They could not but feel that some restraints ought to be preserved,—the opinions of great Apostles, good customs and traditions, the general sentiment of mankind. In the later church Paul's doctrine of liberty was frankly abandoned. He had claimed for every Christian a complete autonomy, and it was recognised that under such conditions there could be no settled creed or ethic, no leadership, no organised community. With human nature as it is, an unlimited freedom would mean anarchy, and the effort of the church was to impose discipline and to strengthen its control over its members. Paul was himself aware that his principle of liberty could not be put fully into effect. He finds himself obliged constantly to qualify his demand, and to allow for circumstances, consideration for others, common prudence, established law and practice. Yet he is never in doubt as to his principle, and insists that it belongs to the very essence of the Christian faith. Even when he is obliged to make concessions he maintains that the Christian is responsible only to his Lord, and therefore is absolutely free.

These, then, may be singled out as the distinctive elements in what may rightly be called Paulinism. It has been Paul's misfortune to be read as a theologian, who supplies the proof-texts for a number of approved doctrines; but to understand his real teaching we need, as a rule, to leave the doctrines out of sight. He did not think of himself as a theologian. He was the messenger of a new religion which had brought life to him, and would also do so to the world. His mind was set on the life-giving principles which were for him the substance of Christianity. He does his best to explain them, and brings to this task the knowledge he had acquired as a Rabbi, the memories which had clung to him from his youth in Tarsus, the ideas

which had found currency in the Hellenistic church. But by means of all this he seeks to convey the truth which had come to him by revelation. This he can only do in very imperfect measure, for it is impossible to express in terms of reason the verities which are beyond reason. As Paul himself declares they cannot be known except by the Spirit which searches the deep things of God. He possessed this spiritual knowledge, and apprehended the gospel in its inward meaning, but his difficulty was to impart to others what was clear beyond question to his own mind. All that he could do was to present in the form of reasoned doctrine what he had received by vision. The church accepted his doctrine but missed the things of which it was only the vehicle. It fastened on the externals of Paul's teaching, on the arguments and analogies by which he tried to drive home his essential thought. His theology was substituted for his religion.

There are other reasons, however, why the church at large has never fully responded to Paul. It has to be admitted that his message, with all its intrinsic truth and greatness, suffers from grave defects, which make it appear no more than an eccentric type. They are usually attributed to his involved and often arbitrary methods of thought, but this is a mistaken view. His message, when all is said, is clearly distinguishable from his doctrines, and is simple and self-evidently true. No presentation of the gospel, it may be repeated, takes such instant hold of the ordinary man as that of Paul. Without much difficulty he can penetrate through the doctrines and grasp the truth behind them. Moreover the doctrines are by no means so obscure as is generally assumed. Theologies far more intricate have succeeded from time to time in securing the assent of the church. One has only to think of the subtle metaphysical creeds which were formulated at the great Councils and imposed themselves on Christendom for more than a thousand years. For that part the Pauline doctrines themselves were elaborated by the Reformers into complex systems, far more abstruse than anything in Romans or Galatians, and yet those confessions became the basis of flourishing churches, and were expounded week by week to companies of plain men and women who found little trouble in comprehending them. The difficulty of Paul has consisted not in his doctrines but in just those principles which constitute his religion. Take, for instance, his doctrine of liberty. To most men since, as in his lifetime, it has seemed to entail a moral danger, and while formally assenting to it they have quietly set it aside. Or take his conception of union with Christ. Such a union, it has been reasonably felt, is only possible to rare saints and mystics, and the ordinary Christian is conscious of an insincerity when he pretends to it. Even faith, as Paul employs the word, involves a frame of mind of which most men feel themselves to be incapable. He declared that salvation is by faith, and from this it would follow that no one could be saved unless he throws himself, with utter self-surrender, on the grace of God as revealed in Christ. A demand of this kind would certainly exclude the great majority of people who call themselves Christians, and faith has been interpreted by the church as a mere acceptance of certain approved beliefs.

The intellectual act is taken as an equivalent of that great act of will which was plainly in the mind of Paul.

For this failure of his message Paul was himself very largely responsible. While he proclaimed the authentic gospel he did so in a one-sided way, so that it may fairly be held that he represents a type of Christianity and not the whole religion. This was inevitable, for he was a unique man, and had come to Christianity through a unique experience. He had received the gospel by a revelation, and the whole power of the revelation lay in its immediate, personal quality. Before other men can enter fully into Paul's religion they would require to have just the same kind of revelation as had come to himself. But in a Christianity on which all can agree there must be a common basis, and there can be no real Christianity unless it appeals to all. Jesus meant his gospel for the world, and, however lofty any presentation of it may be, it fails of its purpose if only a select few can respond. Paul's Christianity has never been accepted by the whole church, and in the nature of things it can never be. The reason may indeed be that it is too purely Christian, but the church rightly feels that its salvation must be within the reach of all. From this point of view the greatness of Paul's teaching was its grand defect; the gold without alloy could not become current coin. It is not a little significant that the Pastoral Epistles, written by some follower of Paul who dilutes his master's doctrine, have exercised a more practical influence on the life of the church than the genuine letters of Paul. By their very inferiority they gave it something which it lacked to make it a working religion. Paul is one of the most individual of all thinkers, and for this reason he is one of the most vital. As we compare him with any of the theologians who have come after him we feel at once that in spite of its outworn forms his message still pulses with life, while the others belong to a dead past. This is because he speaks from a revelation which came directly to himself; he puts us in contact with his own soul. But this individuality which is the strength of Paul's teaching is at the same time its weakness. He was himself aware that he could not fully bring home to his readers what he most desired to say unless he could add his presence to his words. "My little children," he writes in Galatians, "would that I could be with you now and change my voice,"—that is, vary my tones, as cannot be done in a letter. His words cannot have their true effect apart from the living voice, with all its modulations. It may fairly be said of all Paul's writing that he speaks by letter because he cannot be visibly present, and tries to put into his language the very tones of his voice. His style has an intimate quality which has rarely been equalled, but the thing he attempts is impossible. At best we can only half understand him since we do not hear that personal note which gave convincing power to his message.

His other innovation, at first sight a more serious one, was in throwing the whole emphasis on the death of Christ. He changed the centre of gravity in the Christian religion, making everything else depend on a mysterious redemptive act, for the sake of which Christ had come into the world.

To many this has appeared to be the fatal weakness in his teaching. He seems to leave out of account all that Jesus had himself intended. About the ministry in Galilee he has nothing to say; the Parables and the Sermon on the Mount seem to be forgotten. Paul had determined, as he expressly tells us, to know nothing of Christ after the flesh and to think only of the Lord who died and rose again. It is maintained that he thus changed the nature of Christianity, assimilating it to those mystery cults which had their vogue in the Hellenistic world of his time. This, however, is a mere travesty of Paul's message. He knew the life of Jesus, and was awake, as few others have been, to its significance. He knew the teaching of Jesus, and although he seldom quotes it literally his own ethic is entirely moulded by it. But he sees the life, not in its manifold detail, but gathered up as into one burning focus in the Cross. In that crowning act Jesus revealed himself, in all the height and depth of his nature, as he could not do in his daily living. Through the Cross, too, we have the full revelation of that divine love which Jesus proclaimed and manifested, and on which we can utterly rely. It was not the weakness but the strength of Paul's religion that he concentrated on the one fact of the Lord's death. He thereby presented the Christian message in all its simplicity. He made it possible to look away from all side-issues and apprehended the one truth which supremely matters, and which includes in itself all others. There was here no innovation. Paul was intent, as he always was, on the inner meaning of the gospel, which gives it power to renew the lives of all men as it had renewed his own.

[PAUL—STRANGER AND SAINT]

Heinrich Weinel

PAUL ONCE SAID of Moses, "To this day a veil lies on their hearts when he is read," and at present the words may be applied to the apostle himself. To some he has become a great authority, a marvel, or even a canonised saint; to others a mere name, a mass of shadowy recollections and of half-forgotten texts, which they learned as children with much toil and trouble. Few, very few, really know him, and these few are for the most part scholars or theologians.

But for those that do know him, the form of this tentmaker and divine looms ever higher and higher in the world's history. They feel that they are in the presence of one who, having suffered, struggled, and prevailed, has left the impress of his character upon many centuries; one with whose individuality we of to-day have still to reckon, as did those who saw him face to face, and were carried away by the mighty words that proceeded out of his mouth.

Just as during his lifetime he was loved and hated as scarce any other man has been, so he fares to this day amongst those that know him. Here we have the proof of his imperishable greatness. Nor should we be astonished to find that he was hated as bitterly as he was loved. Every active, independent mind excites hatred and love at once. Even He who was Incarnate Love was compelled to give utterance to the sad and painful words: "I come to set at variance a man with his father, a daughter with her mother, and a man's foes will be they of his own household." But He knew too what that man was worth who never made a foe: "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." So He spake who loved His enemies even unto His death.

Let us listen to two of St Paul's adversaries of our own day—two men in whom an accurate acquaintance with the facts of the case was combined with a bold, intrepid spirit and a clear sense of truth, and who for all that hated the apostle as only one of those great personalities can be hated that sin against humanity.

Lagarde (see the *Deutsche Schriften*, 1886, pp. 71 fol.) conceives himself justified in presenting the following picture of St Paul to the German people:—

"It was only owing to the fact that the disciples chosen by Jesus Himself were able to form but an extremely inadequate, one-sided conception—it was almost a caricature—of the great picture that their eyes had gazed upon, that a complete stranger, an outsider, came to exercise influence upon the Church.

From *St. Paul*, translated by G. A. Bienemann, London, 1906, pp. 1-12. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Williams and Norgate, Ltd., and G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"Paul—for so this outsider was called—was a true child of Abraham, a Pharisee from top to toe even after he became a Christian. He persecuted the Nazarenes with all his might for a while, and was then convinced—it was some eight or ten years after Jesus' death—by a vision on a journey to Damascus that he was persecuting the truth in showing himself hostile to Jesus' teaching. This may be found to be psychologically conceivable, and I do not doubt in the very least that so fanatical a character was converted (in consequence of a hallucination) into the very opposite of that which he had been some time previously. But it is monstrous that men of any historical training should attach any importance whatever to this Paul. . . .

"It was Paul who introduced the Old Testament into the Church, through the influence of which book the Gospel has perished as far as it could perish: it was Paul who conferred upon us the priceless boon of the Pharisaic exegesis which proves everything from whatever you like, inserting the contents ready-made into the text which are supposed to be found therein, and then pluming itself on a faithful adherence to the very words of Scripture: it was Paul who popularised the Jewish sacrificial theory pregnant with so many consequences: it is he . . . who saddled us with the Jewish view of history. All this he did in spite of the energetic protests of the early Christian Church, which, Jewish as it was, was less Jewish than Paul in its opinions, and at least did not hold a refined form of the Israelite faith to be a gospel sent by God. Paul was impervious to all criticism. The book of Exodus furnished him with a defence proof against all arguments. 'Pharaoh's heart was hardened.' With such a theory it is as easy to dispute as it is easy to send a man about his business if he comes to you with arguments and wishes to hear your answer. You have only to say: 'His heart was hardened.'"

In Lagarde you have the theologian, the man who feels that heavy yoke of dogma which Paul more than all others has laid upon us—for Paul has become the law and canon of our faith.

Nietzsche, on the other hand, hates in Paul the man, his struggles and his redemption. A passage in the *Morgenröte*, in which the author sums up his judgment upon Paul, will be sufficient to show this:—

"The majority of people still believe in the work of the Holy Ghost as author, or are under the after-effects of this belief: if they open their Bibles it is to 'get some good,' to find some indication of comfort in their own personal need, be it great or small—in a word, they find in the Bible what they put into it. But who knows, with the exception of a few scholars, that in the Bible there also stands recorded the history of one of the most ambitious of men, a past master in importunacy whose superstition was only equalled by his cunning? That is the history of the apostle Paul. But if it had not been for this strange story, if it had not been for the aberrations of his mind and the waves of emotion that passed over his soul, there would be no Christianity. . . . Of course, if the story had been understood in time, if Paul's writings had been read, really read, not as revelations of 'the Holy Ghost,' but with an honest, unfettered, independent

mind and without thinking of all our personal needs—there were no such readers for fifteen centuries—then Christianity would also have come to an end long ago. It is this same story—the story of this much tortured, much to be pitied man, an exceedingly unpleasant personage both to himself and others—which shows us how the ship of Christianity threw a good portion of its Jewish ballast overboard, so that it was enabled to go out among the heathen.”

Much against their will, Lagarde and Nietzsche are alike compelled to recognise the importance of the man while condemning him and his work. But we shall have something more to say as to this severe condemnation. For, however severe and unhistorical it may be, it must be based upon certain facts and certain features in the apostle's character. And that is the very reason why it is all the more dangerous, for it has rightly been observed that half a truth is more dangerous than a lie.

Another and a very difficult problem has arisen, however, for those who, while accepting the apostle's every word as their authority, have acquired some insight into his individuality, his work, and his greatness. Schell has very clearly and rightly defined it in the introduction to his *Christus* when he asks: “Who has the greater claim to be called the founder of the world-religion, Jesus or Paul? Who has the right to be counted the originator of ecclesiastical Christianity with its belief in original sin, vicarious sacrifice, the atonement, the sacraments, and the Christian ministry?”

There can be no doubt that we should give the answer “Paul” to the latter question, even though the organisation of the Christian ministry was not his work but that of his successors. Even the first question may be answered with “Paul” if by Christianity we understand belief in dogmas as to the person of Christ and His propitiatory death. For of all the Christians of the first generation Paul was the first, as far as we know, to attempt a theoretical explanation of His death.

It is all the more regrettable that Paul is so little known, for what Schell says of Roman Catholic Christianity can be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to our Protestant people: “And yet St Paul, a saint if ever there was one, who has fanned into flame the fire of devotion in so many a heart in search of its God, has never become an object of religious worship—in the real sense of the word—as the Virgin Mary, as St Joseph, as St Anthony, as St Aloysius. St Paul has always remained a stranger to the soul of the people.”

We are not surprised that Paul has never become a popular Roman Catholic saint, in spite of all official ecclesiastical honour that is paid to him; for there is nothing whatever Catholic in the rugged, sharply outlined features of this soldier of the Cross. But it is all the more remarkable that Paul *our* apostle still remains, on the whole, a sealed book to our Protestant people, a book of which a few words are known by heart, but which otherwise is never disturbed in its place on the bookshelf. St. Paul, however, was something more than a collection of aphorisms on the subjects of sin and grace. Of all the Christians of the first generations he is by far

the most conspicuous, in very truth a man of genius. When Jesus and the faith of His first disciples had won their victory over this man—their greatest adversary—then Christianity triumphed as it never did before or since.

It was an event of world-historic importance as well. For it is a great deal more than a mere fanciful comparison when it is said that the apostle's great missionary journeys from Antioch to Rome were a repetition of Alexander the Great's conquests, only in the opposite direction. The very first of historians, Herodotus, "the father of history," saw that the chief subject in the many chapters of the history of humanity was that never-ending exchange, that great struggle between the civilisations of East and West, in which Alexander's expedition marks the first decisive battle wherein the West scores an apparent victory. Now St Paul's mission, with which Christianity enters upon its triumphant progress, forms the introduction to the last and most important epoch in this same struggle.

The great mission of Christianity is in reality mainly St Paul's work, the work of a man who knew not fear, and whose pride was to be called by one title, and one alone: an apostle of Jesus the Christ. To Him he sacrificed in true manliness all the strength he possessed, and for Him he won the victory. At his death the new faith stretched from one end of the empire to the other, as far as Rome, in a chain of flourishing congregations. When he was won over to the cause of Jesus, Christianity was an insignificant Jewish sect. Though the disciples had found life and salvation in their faith in Jesus, the Messiah who had died for sinners and had been raised up by God, they did not know all that they had in Him. Jesus of Nazareth had given them much, but after all they could not quite efface the impression that they had looked upon a pious Jew who had fought and who had suffered for the right exposition of the law and for the purity of the Temple. So they sat at Jerusalem and preached and waited for Him to descend upon the clouds of heaven with the New Jerusalem and His many mansions for the poor and devout children of God. They were, it is true, hated and persecuted by many of their fellow-countrymen. They were dispersed to Samaria and as far as Antioch; but they did not know that a new religion had started on its progress throughout the world, and that all the peoples of the earth were destined to find therein their blessedness and their salvation. Paul was the first to experience Christianity as a new religion in his own life, in fightings without, in fears within; and it was he who saved it when the Twelve could scarcely keep it from sinking down into Judaism again, so heavily were they oppressed by the weight of ancient Jewish tradition.

These external effects are but the manifestation of the all-compelling power that resided within him. St Paul is a hero in the domain of the will, a born leader of men. He is also a hero in the domain of thought. We have grown accustomed to look upon the history of thought as the history of philosophy, and to look for its chief exponents among the constructors of great systems of thought—men who renounce every form of activity. We are mistaken, however, for decisive action rests upon decisive insight.

And this we find in its original power just as frequently among great poets and prophets and men of great force of will as amongst thinkers in the narrower sense of the word. St Paul has impressed for ever a whole series of fundamental ideas, above all, a new outline of history, and certain ethical conceptions and observations, on the thought of the Western world. Millions of men to-day think with his thoughts and speak with his words, who have but the vaguest notion of his personal life.

St Paul is also epoch-making in the history of religion. Whilst Jesus falls out of the line of development of the Judaism of His time as much as He belongs to it, Paul forms the natural reaction against the theology of the Scribes, which was an attempt to organise the people according to the prophetic ideal by a codified string of laws. Here, as ever, the means became an end, and the organisation came finally to be the sworn foe of every prophetic element in the people: John the Baptist and Jesus are opposed to the Scribes and Pharisees. Now, Paul is the Pharisee, in whom the weight of the law upon a true and genuine soul was so oppressive that it finally burst all fetters, and turned in its destructive energy against the law—against all law, in every religion. Paul is the great discoverer of the fact that God and the law are contrary the one to the other, and that the only way in which the law can lead to God is by becoming our torment and awaking in us a longing for escape. Paul could only attain after sore struggles, in the hardest hour of his life, to that goal which for Jesus was the natural childlike life of love felt for the heavenly Father. But the position thus gained was, moreover, maintained; triumphantly Paul repelled all attacks, and so rescued this priceless possession for all mankind. Yet once again it was recaptured by the old religion in the shape of Roman Catholicism, until Martin Luther, having passed through a crisis like that of Paul, recovered it with Paul's words for his weapons.

There are, however, other reasons for the important position which Paul occupies in the religious history of the West. In the West, the soul of man has ever yearned to obtain two blessings by means of religion—holiness and immortality. In scarcely any man in ancient times has this yearning been manifested as clearly and as loudly as in Paul; no one has ever believed with such intensity that his yearning had been satisfied, and in no one has this belief been transformed into as great a capacity for ethical volition and courageous action. That is why he has kindled this same inner life in so many others; and the flame of his enthusiasm still burns throughout the centuries, in spite of the dross still visible in his personality, after all that the ecclesiastical refiners and purifiers have done.

There was yet another factor in St Paul's nature, which rendered him especially capable of influencing the age in which he lived, and of satisfying the particular way in which it sought for holiness and immortality. In Paul two currents meet: that flowing from all religions of antiquity in so far as they had been re-cast in mysteries and Hellenistic philosophy of religion, and that proceeding from the unique religious life of Israel. Just as St Paul is the first Protestant if we look at his religion, so he is the first Catholic if we think of his theology and ecclesiastical activity. Jesus is a

far more solitary figure in His time, however much He belonged to it; and to this day His position in history is far more isolated than that of Paul, who had absorbed a great deal more of the general knowledge and culture of his day. That is why Paul's influence was greater than that of Jesus, who could only be apprehended by the Gentile world, with its longing for mysteries, sacraments, and philosophy, through and by means of Paul. And here we come to the last and greatest question which Paul raises for us. Is the Christianity which Paul preached, and which still lives to-day in Church and dogma, another religion than the gospel which Jesus proclaimed? What is the significance of dogma and of Church for the history of Christianity? But with these questions the problem presented by St Paul's life becomes a present-day problem of the most immediate interest.

For at the present day the very existence of Christianity is at stake, and the struggle is concentrated upon two positions. The first question round which the tide of battle surges is this: Can Christianity be separated from the conceptions of the fall, original sin, the blood-bought atonement of God, and the sacraments which it owed to Paul above all others when it entered with him on the great stage of the world's history? Those who answer this question in the negative are either people who stifle the claims of reason for the sake of Christianity, for reason is for ever repeating to them that the modern conception of the world is the right one; or, again, they are men who doubt their religion because of the claims of reason, and in this state they either cling to the morality of Christianity, or cast even that overboard into the sea of doubt. And this brings us to the second position round which the contest is being waged. Men are realising more and more clearly that the ethics of the Christian Church are a weak compromise between the stern morality of Jesus, with its note of hostility to the world, and the claims of the State and civilisations, or even the demands of human convenience and the love of domination. And the question as to its truth has come upon Christianity like the thief in the night.

Here, too, St Paul plays an important part, for it is he who laid the foundations of the Church and paved the way for its reconciliation with the "world"—that is, with the life of the ancient state and civilisation. Nor can anyone pretend to solve these problems, either for himself or for others, who has not obtained some insight into their historical origin. This insight he will obtain from none better than St Paul.

WHAT IS PAUL FOR THE JEWS?

Joseph Klausner

THE JEWS COULD not have taken any attitude toward Paul and his teaching except a negative one. So in his time, and so after his time, up to the present day.

The Jews also rejected Jesus; yet he is mentioned a number of times in Talmud and Midrash—and not always unfavorably. But Paul is mentioned clearly not even once in either of the two Talmuds or in any early Midrash. Only hints about him can be found in the Talmud. In this connection Aaron Jellinek calls attention to the following saying of R. Eleazar of Modi'im, a contemporary of R. Akiba (and thus not much later than Paul):

If a man profanes the Hallowed things [some texts read "the Sabbaths"] and despises the set feasts and puts his fellow to shame publicly and makes void the covenant of Abraham our father [circumcision], and discloses meanings in the Law which are not according to the *Halakab*, even though a knowledge of the Law and good works are his, he has no share in the world to come. (Aboth III 11/12.)

Jellinek believes that this saying is directed almost entirely against Paul, who abrogated the Sabbaths, the fixed festivals, and circumcision, and interpreted the Torah in a perverted manner. Rabbi I. H. Weiss also finds hints in the Talmud and Midrash against Paul, his associates, and his teaching. Likewise, the writer of these lines sees Paul in "that pupil" who scoffed at Rabban Gamaliel and his expositions of the material blessings of the Messianic age, claiming that the blessings would be *only spiritual*. According to his own testimony, Paul sat "at the feet of Gamaliel"; also he said, ". . . the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." The Talmudic writer did not wish to specify Paul by name and called him "that pupil," just as afterwards Jesus was called "that man."

If the writers of Talmud and Midrash refused to mention the name of Paul specifically, while they mentioned the name of Jesus many times, and if in the hints about him there is suppressed anger against him, then it is clear that the great majority of Jews in the generation of Paul and in the generations following were strongly opposed to him and his teaching, just as plainly appears from the book of Acts and from the Epistles of Paul himself.

But it was not only the Jews who were opposed to him. Likewise the

From *From Jesus to Paul*, translated by W. F. Stinespring, New York, 1943, pp. 600-10. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, The Macmillan Co.

Jewish Nazarenes, especially the Ebionites, hated him exceedingly and told of him such things as the following:—Paul of Tarsus was a Greek. His father and mother were both Greeks. He went to Jerusalem. Because he ardently desired to marry a daughter of the priest (high priest?—*θυγάτηρ τοῦ ἱερέως*), he became a proselyte and was circumcised. But because he was not allowed to marry the girl, he became angry and wrote against circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Torah. Of course, all this is mere fabrication. Yet by this fabrication is proved how strong was the animosity of the Nazarenes toward Paul.

Can the Jews not accept anything of Paul's?

His teaching in toto absolutely not. Yet there are in his writings certain ideas and expressions which are so lofty and beautiful that no nation and no tongue can do without them. Is this not all the more true of the nation from which Paul came forth and to which he belonged all his life, the nation for which he was ready to be "anathema" and in whose sons he saw his "brethren" and "kinsmen according to the flesh"?

The Hymn to Love, or as it is also called, Love's Song of Songs (1 Cor., ch. 13), cannot be the principal foundation stone of Israel's faith. But as long as the human heart beats, sublime and beautiful words like these shall never be forgotten:

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels
And have not love
I am become as clanging brass or a tinkling cymbal.

Likewise the expression "love edifieth," and "love, which is the bond of perfectness." There is no religion like Judaism in holding the *good heart* superior to the rest of human virtues; there is none like it in considering the love that wells up from the depths of the soul better than the utmost virtues, better even than knowledge. More than that, Judaism it is that taught

For into an evil-devising soul Wisdom entereth not,
Neither doth she dwell in a body enslaved by sin.
(Wis. Sol. 1:4.)

To this great and noble conception Paul gave most eloquent and forceful expression. And Judaism cannot do without this, even if it can accept it only with certain reservations.

Likewise, Judaism can accept with certain reservations the beautiful saying, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Paul means to convey by this saying, of course, the idea often repeated in his Epistles, that the minute details of the Law bring one, by their many prohibitions, merely to the point of being under sentence of death, while the Christian spirit sets one free from these prohibitions, and thus gives us back our life. To a view like this Judaism can never agree. Judaism honors also the letter, because the letter is the clothing of the spirit. But if the letter becomes petrified and petrifies the spirit, then Judaism rejects the *dead*

letter. Judaism recognizes only the *living letter*—that letter which is always prepared to take on a new meaning according to the demands of the time. What is the whole Talmud with its marvellous interpretation of Torah except an adaptation of the letter to the needs of life? Thus it introduces a spirit of life into the letter and makes the letter itself a spiritual force, a living and life-giving letter and not a dead and death-dealing letter.

For example, if it is impossible for a man to exist without going from place to place on the Sabbath, the Talmud comes along and interprets *Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day* thus: Let him not carry objects from a private domain to a public. And even for such carrying, when it is hard to avoid, the Talmud finds permission by means of the *'Erub*. Again, according to the Law, debts are to be cancelled in the year of release; but when this tended "to close the door in the face of borrowers," Hillel the Elder came and instituted, in accordance with the *living letter*, the *prozbul*, which made it possible for both borrower and lender to negotiate loans without fear of the forfeiture of the money. And there has been much more of the same sort. Indeed, the whole history of Jewish religious literature exhibits a continuous adaptation of the dead letter to the living spirit of the individual and the nation through the development of their ideas ("*Eye for eye* means pecuniary compensation") and the fusing of their needs.

And if Paul says to the Christians,

... we are a temple of the living God; even as God said, "I will dwell among them and walk among them, and I will be their God and they shall be My people,"

why of course this is a Jewish idea, as is proved by the very verses [Ex. 29: 45; Jer. 31:33] which Paul uses for support. And when Paul says "... know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you?"—this also is a Jewish idea, as is proved by the story ... about Hillel the Elder's saying that the body is in the image of God and thus is a sacred thing. And if the body is such, how much more so the soul!

Judaism will also accept from Paul the lovely saying, "Quench not the spirit." Of course, Judaism does not put undue emphasis on the contrast between "flesh" and "spirit." It does not see them as two domains *absolutely* opposed to one another, nor does it advocate *complete* repression of the flesh for the sake of the abstract and ascetic spirit, denying, for instance, the value of marriage, and sponsoring such things as convents and monasteries; attitudes and practices of this kind inevitably dissipate any opportunity for "reforming the world," and nullify any "precaution for the general good." To meet actual widespread needs, Judaism greatly modifies the stricter regulations, which are so difficult to observe in a world more complex and developed than that which existed in the early days of the Torah. But Judaism also knows how to honor the spirit and hold it superior to the flesh; however, Judaism seeks to uplift the flesh by means of the spirit. Paul had reference, of course, in his admonition to "quench not the Spirit" to the "Holy Spirit" which had taken hold of groups of believers enthusiastic to the point of madness, as is proved by these words

immediately following: "despise not prophesyings." We, the Jews, take the words in their ordinary sense, knowing how to appreciate them as they are. In like manner, we know how to appreciate all the lofty ideas and beautiful sayings of Paul; but we cannot accept his phantasms or the asceticism and the pessimism in his Epistles.

But there is something still greater and more important than the items which I have enumerated above as being to the credit of Paul.

There is a very curious fact in the world. It is that Judaism has survived for thousands of years dispersed among *Christian* and *Moslem* peoples, but has not survived—at least as a proper national community fulfilling an important cultural function—either in India, China, or Japan. To be sure, Jewish communities did exist in India and China for hundreds of years, but were finally assimilated by the Indians or Chinese, or else reduced to the point of a "negligible quantity," having no importance either within the total Jewish community, or in the world at large.

What is the reason for this?—

In my opinion, only in a place where the Hebrew Old Testament, in its original form and in translation, is recognized—alongside the New Testament and the Koran—as a great and influential religious book; or in a place where the great Jewish cultural influence of the "book of Books" is a third part of the total culture alongside the influence of the cultures of Greece and Rome—only in such a place can Judaism survive as a religio-national unit, to develop its internal life and also to influence the outside world. In a place where the Old Testament is not a recognized and influential cultural force, there Judaism is not revealed as a power to itself and to others, and it steadily wastes away or else "vegetates" (*vegetiert*) without revelatory or creative power.

And Paul had this great merit, that in spite of his abrogation of the Torah, he leaned for support in almost every important religious question upon verses from that Torah. To be sure, this constitutes an internal contradiction in his teaching; but it is a fact which cannot be denied. This fact cannot be explained except by supposing that he was firmly rooted in Pharisaic Judaism in spite of himself. In the nine Pauline letters which are considered genuine, there are 84 quotations from the Old Testament, most of them following the Septuagint (according to my hypothesis, Paul incorporated them ready-made into his Greek Epistles, or the copyists of the Epistles, knowing only Greek, changed the quotations to conform to the translation familiar to them) and a few of them following the Hebrew original. And a scholar [Windisch] who endeavors to prove that Paul is fit company even for the "Aryans" is forced to admit that "the sayings of Moses, David, Solomon, and the prophets are more familiar to him than the sayings of Jesus!" "Indeed," continues this scholar, "one is almost tempted to put it this way: the influence of Gamaliel was stronger in him than the influence of Jesus." And further on this same scholar says: "Paul was well-versed in the Old Testament. The Old Testament appears to have had a more enduring and stronger influence upon him than the

tradition of Jesus." At any rate, explains this Christian scholar, a Christian community which rejects the Old Testament will fail to understand the most and the best of Paul's Epistles, and will be forced to remove them from its Canon. To this it may be added, that Paul interpreted Scripture like a thorough Pharisee—something which incensed so much the "spiritual anti-Semite," Paul de Lagarde. This is what I have called "Talmudic casuistry for an anti-Talmudic purpose."

Of course, there is a strong contradiction between advocating nullification of the Torah, and leaning for support on the Torah even to prove that it itself should be set aside. But the fact remains that Paul, the founder of Christianity as a religion and as a church, based all his new teaching upon the "Old" Testament. This is one of the fundamental reasons why the Church Fathers, with all the hate which most of them had for Jews and Judaism, were *forced* to include the Old Testament in the Christian Canon, to endow it with the sacredness of Holy Scripture, and to place it on an equal footing with the writings of the New Testament. This fact is responsible for the powerful influence of Jewish culture upon what is called "Christian civilization," although it would be more correct to call it European-Oriental [or European-Near Eastern] civilization, since it is based upon Judaism no less than upon the cultures of Greece and Rome. Hence the feeling of Jews living among Christians (and the weaker, but still strong feeling of Jews living among Moslems), that the culture of the dominant people is not something altogether foreign to them, like the cultures of India, China, and Japan, for example, and that their share in this culture is large, amounting to a third part, and more than a third, of the cultural accomplishments of those countries where dwell the Jews. This inward feeling, which may not come to the point of open recognition, has given the Jews a creative power within their own group and a power to influence the Gentiles among whom they have been in exile. If most of these Gentiles had not accepted the Old Testament, this creativity and this influence would not have been possible even to an imperfect degree (since exile is naturally an imperfect state!) in the midst of the tribulations, afflictions, persecutions, and humiliations of an exile lasting two thousand years.

This is the great merit of Paul for Judaism.

Perhaps he did not intend to do this; but the "Pharisee, a son of Pharisees," the disciple of Rabban Gamaliel, was so filled and saturated with the Written Law, and to a certain extent with the Oral Law (interpretation of the Scriptures) also, that it was impossible for him *not* to base his teaching on the Holy Scriptures of his people, against whom Paul became angry and spoke harsh words, yet from whom he never to his last days separated himself completely.

My deepest conviction is this: Judaism will never become reconciled with Christianity (in the sense of spiritual [religious and intellectual] compromise), nor will it be assimilated by Christianity; for Judaism and Christianity are not only two different religions, but they are also *two different*

world-views. Judaism will never allow itself to reach even in theory the ethical extremeness characteristic of Christianity; this extremeness has no place in the world of reality, and therefore is likely in actual fact to be converted into its direct opposite—into brutality such as has been seen in the Middle Ages and in our own time in any number of “Christian” countries. Judaism could say, “What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbor: that is the whole Torah”; but it could also say, “Great is vengeance, which is placed between two references to the Divine Name” (Psa. 94:1 says literally, “*God of vengeance, the Lord*”). It could receive into the Holy Scriptures both the book of Jonah with its love of the enemy, and the book of Esther with its hate of the enemy. This fact comes from two deep causes. *First*, Judaism knows that the nature of man will always be human nature and not angel nature. *Second*, the God of Israel is *the God of history*; and in history there is *justice*. Evil consequences are *inevitably* the recompense of evil deeds:

Thine own wickedness shall correct thee,
And thy backsliding shall reprove thee.

Judaism is a more practical faith than Christianity, it is more capable of realization in actual life; that is why it has such great vitality in spite of the severe difficulties attendant upon the observance of its numerous and strict ceremonial laws, and in spite of persecutions and humiliations the like of which no other nation or tongue has ever suffered. Therefore, it is not to be supposed that Judaism could accept the teaching of Paul, with its phantasms and mysteries, and with its asceticism and abandonment of life, the results of its loathing of the “flesh” and its deep pessimism.

But we, the Jews, hope and expect that the time shall come when the prayer which we pray three times daily—the ‘*Aleinu*’ prayer—shall be realized, and the Kingdom of Heaven in the Jewish sense of ethical monotheism shall be established in the world, and the politico-spiritual Messianic ideal of Israel shall also be realized in all its fulness, and the Jewish people shall dwell in their historic national land, and shall speak their historic national tongue, and shall continue to develop their historic national culture in the spirit of their prophets and their sages. Then, of course, much shall be changed in the ceremonial laws of Judaism, although they shall not be altogether abolished, since they serve to protect the existence of the nation. And when in those days the mystical and un-Jewish quality of important parts of Paul’s teaching shall be done away with, and Judaism in the form of ethico-prophetic monotheism shall spread over all the world—then shall this refined Judaism know how to appreciate the great merit of Paul; that through him the pagan world accepted, along with many strange and unnatural superstitions, the Jewish Bible as the foundation and basis of a religion for the Gentiles. In this sense—and only in this great and deep sense—was Paul also what Maimonides so beautifully called Jesus:

A preparer of the way for the King-Messiah.

PAUL AND JESUS

J. Gresham Machen

THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS [radical minds], say, is an example of megalomania; Jesus, they say, was insane. Such is said to be the diagnosis of certain alienists. And the diagnosis need cause no alarm. Very likely it is correct. But the Jesus who is being investigated by the alienists is not the Jesus of the New Testament. The liberal Jesus, if he ever existed, may have been insane. But that is not the Jesus whom the Christian loves. The alienists are investigating a man who thought he was divine and was not divine; about one who thought He was divine and was divine they have obviously nothing to say.

Two difficulties, therefore, face the reconstruction of the liberal Jesus. In the first place, it is difficult to separate the natural from the supernatural in the Gospel picture of Jesus; and in the second place, after the separation has been accomplished, the human Jesus who is left is found to be a monstrosity, with a contradiction at the very center of His being. Such a Jesus, it may fairly be maintained, could never have existed on earth.

But suppose He did exist, suppose the psychological impossibilities of His character be ignored. Even then the difficulties of the historian are not overcome. Another question remains. How did this human Jesus ever come to give place to the superhuman Jesus of the New Testament? The transition evidently occurred at a very early time. It is complete in the Epistle of Paul. And within Paul's experience it was certainly no late development; on the contrary it was evidently complete at the very beginning of his Christian life; the Jesus in whom he trusted at the time of his conversion was certainly the heavenly Christ of the Epistles. But the conversion occurred only a very few years, at the most, after the crucifixion of Jesus. Moreover, there is in the Pauline Epistles not the slightest trace of a conflict between the heavenly Christ of Paul and any "other Jesus" of the primitive Jerusalem Church; apparently the Christ of Paul was also the Christ of those who had walked and talked with Jesus of Nazareth. Such is the evidence of the Epistles. It is confirmed by the Gospels. Like Paul, the Gospels present no mere teacher of righteousness, but a heavenly Redeemer. Yet the Gospels make the impression of being independent of Paul. Everywhere the Jesus that they present is most strikingly similar to the Christ of Paul; but nowhere—not even where Jesus is made to teach the redemptive significance of His death (Mk. x. 45)—is there the slightest evidence of literary dependence upon the Epistles. Thus the liberal Jesus, if he ever

From *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, New York, 1921, pp. 158-68. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, and the author's trustees.

existed, has disappeared from the pages of history; all the sources agree in presenting a heavenly Christ. How shall such agreement be explained?

It might conceivably be explained by the appearances of the risen Christ. If, at the very beginning of the Church's life, Jesus appeared to His disciples, after His death, alive and in heavenly glory, it is conceivable that that experience might have originated the lofty New Testament conception of Jesus' person. But what in turn caused that experience itself? On naturalistic principles the appearances of the risen Christ can be explained only by an impression which the disciples already had of the majesty of Jesus' person. If they had listened to lofty claims of Jesus like those which are recorded in the Gospels, if they had witnessed miracles like the walking on the water or the feeding of the five thousand, then, conceivably though not probably, they might have come to believe that so great a person could not be holden of death, and this belief might have been sufficient, without further miracle, to induce the pathological experiences in which they thought they saw Him alive after His passion. But if the miraculous be removed from the life of Jesus, a double portion of the miraculous must be heaped up upon the appearances. The smaller be the Jesus whom the disciples had known in Galilee, the more unaccountable becomes the experience which caused them to believe in His resurrection. By one path or another, therefore, the historian of Christian origins is pushed off from the safe ground of the phenomenal world toward the abyss of supernaturalism. To account for the faith of the early Church, the supernatural must be found either in the life of Jesus on earth, or else in the appearances of the risen Christ. But if the supernatural is found in one place, there is no objection to finding it in both places. And in both places it is found by the whole New Testament.

Three difficulties, therefore, beset the reconstruction of the "liberal Jesus." In the first place, it is difficult to disengage His picture from the miraculous elements which have defaced it in the Gospels; in the second place, when the supposed historical Jesus has been reconstructed, there is a moral contradiction at the center of His being, caused by His lofty claims; in the third place, it is hard to see how, in the thinking of the early disciples, the purely human Jesus gave place without the slightest struggle to the heavenly Christ of the Pauline Epistles and of the whole New Testament.

But suppose all the difficulties have been removed. Suppose a human Jesus has been reconstructed. What is the result of comparing that human Jesus with Paul? At first sight there seems to be nothing but contradiction. But closer examination discloses points of agreement. The agreement between Jesus and Paul extends even to those elements in the Gospel account of Jesus which are accepted by modern naturalistic criticism.

In the first place, Jesus and Paul present the same view of the Kingdom of God. The term "Kingdom of God" is not very frequent in the Epistles; but it is used as though familiar to the readers, and when it does occur, it has the same meaning as in the teaching of Jesus. The similarity appears, in the first place, in a negative feature—both in Jesus and in Paul, the idea

of the Kingdom is divorced from all political and materialistic associations. That fact may seem to us to be a matter of course. But in the Judaism of the first century it was far from being a matter of course. On the contrary, it meant nothing less than a revolution in thought and in life. How did Paul, the patriot and the Pharisee, come to separate the thought of the Kingdom from political associations? How did he come to do so even if he had come to think that the Messiah had already appeared? How did he come to do so unless he was influenced in some way by the teaching of Jesus? But the similarity is not merely negative. In positive aspects also, the Kingdom of God in Paul is similar to that which appears in the teaching of Jesus. Both in Jesus and in Paul, the implications of entrance are ethical. "Or know ye not," says Paul, "that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. vi. 9). Then follows, after these words, as in Gal. v. 19-21, a long list of sins which exclude a man from participation in the Kingdom. Paul is here continuing faithfully the teaching of Him who said, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Finally both in Jesus and in Paul the Kingdom appears partly as present and partly as future. In the above passages from Galatians and 1 Corinthians, for example, and in 1 Cor. xv. 50, it is future; whereas in such passages as Rom. xiv. 17 ("for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit"), the present aspect is rather in view. The same two aspects of the Kingdom appear also in the teaching of Jesus; all attempts at making Jesus' conception thoroughly eschatological have failed. Both in Jesus and in Paul, therefore, the Kingdom of God is both transcendent and ethical. Both in Jesus and in Paul, finally, the coming of the Kingdom means joy as well as judgment. When Paul says that the Kingdom of God is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," he is like Jesus not merely in word but in the whole spirit of the message; Jesus also proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom as a "gospel."

In the second place, Paul is like Jesus in his doctrine of the fatherhood of God. That doctrine, it will probably be admitted, was characteristic of Jesus; indeed the tendency in certain quarters is to regard it as the very sum and substance of all that Jesus said. Certainly no parallel to Jesus' presentation of God as Father has been found in extra-Christian literature. The term "father" is indeed applied to God here and there in the Old Testament. But in the Old Testament it is usually in relation to the people of Israel that God is thought of as Father rather than in relation to the individual. Even in the Old Testament, it is true, the conception of the fatherhood of God is not without importance. The consciousness of belonging to God's chosen people and thus being under God's fatherly care was immensely valuable for the life of the individual Israelite; it was no mere product of an unsatisfying state religion like the religions of Greece or Rome. There was preparation in Old Testament revelation, here as elsewhere, for the coming of the Messiah. In Jewish literature outside of the Old Testament, moreover, and in rabbinical sources, the conception of God as Father is not altogether absent. But it appears comparatively seldom, and it lacks altogether the true content of Jesus' teaching. Despite all previous

uses of the word "father" as applied to God, Jesus was ushering in a new era when He taught His disciples to say, "Our Father which art in heaven."

This conception of the fatherhood of God appears in Paul in just the same way as in Jesus. In Paul as well as in Jesus it is not something to be turned to occasionally; on the contrary it is one of the constituent elements of the religious life. It is no wonder that the words, "God our Father," appear regularly at the beginnings of the Epistles. The fatherhood of God in Paul is not something to be argued about or defended; it is altogether a matter of course. But it has not lost, through repetition, one whit of its freshness. The name "Father" applied to God in Paul is more than a bare title; it is the welling up of the depths of the soul. "Abba, Father" on the lips of Paul's converts was exactly the same, not only in form but also in deepest import, as the word which Jesus first taught His disciples when they said to Him, "Lord, teach us to pray."

But the fatherhood of God in Paul is like the teaching of Jesus in even more definite ways than in the fervor of the religious life which it evokes. It is also like Jesus' teaching in being the possession, not of the world, but of the household of faith. If, indeed, the fatherhood of God in Jesus' teaching were like the fatherhood of God in modern liberalism—a relationship which God sustains toward men as men—then it would be as far removed as possible from the teaching of Paul. But as a matter of fact, both Paul and Jesus reserved the term Father for the relation in which God stands to the disciples of Jesus. One passage, indeed (Matt. v. 45; Luke vi. 35), has been quoted as making God the Father of all men. But only by a strange misinterpretation. It is strange how in the day of our boasted grammatico-historical exegesis, so egregious an error can be allowed to live. The prejudices of the reader have triumphed here over all exegetical principles; a vague modernism has been attributed to the sternest, as well as most merciful, Prophet who ever walked upon earth. When Jesus says, "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust," He certainly does not mean that God is the Father of all men both evil and good. God cares for all, but He is not said to be the Father of all. On the contrary, it may almost be said that the very point of the passage is that God cares for all although He is not the Father of all. That it is which makes Him the example for those who are to do good not merely to friends or brothers but also to enemies.

This interpretation does not mean that God does not stand toward all men in a relation analogous to that of a father to his children; it does not mean that He does not love all or care for all. But it does mean that however close may be the relationship which God sustains to all men, the lofty term Father is reserved for a relationship which is far more intimate still. Jesus extends to all men those common blessings which the modern preacher sums up in the term "fatherhood of God"; but He extends to His own disciples not only those blessings but infinitely more. It is not the men of the world—not the "publicans," not the "Gentiles"—who can say.

according to the teaching of Jesus, "Our Father which art in Heaven." Rather it is the little group of Jesus' disciples—which little group, however, all without exception are freely invited to join.

So it is exactly also in the teaching of Paul. God stands, according to Paul, in a vital relation to all men. He is the author of the being of all; He cares for all; He has planted His law in the hearts of all. He stands thus in a relation toward all which is analogous to that of father to child. The Book of Acts is quite in accord with the Epistles when it makes Paul say of all men, "For we are also His offspring." But in Paul just as in Jesus the lofty term "Father" is reserved for a more intimate relationship. Paul accepts all the truth of natural religion; all the truth that reappears in the vague liberalism of modern times. But he adds to it the truth of the gospel. Those are truly sons of God, he says, who have been received by adoption into God's household, and in whose hearts God's Spirit cries, "Abba, Father."

There was nothing narrow about such a gospel; for the door of the household of faith was opened wide to all. Jesus had died in order to open that door, and the apostle went up and down the world, enduring peril upon peril in order to bring men in. There was need for such service, because of sin. Neither in Jesus nor in Paul is sin covered up, nor the necessity of a great transformation concealed. Jesus came not to reveal to men that they were already children of God, but to make them God's children by His redeeming work.

In the third place, Paul is like Jesus in presenting a doctrine of grace. Of course he is like the Jesus of the Gospels; for the Jesus of the Gospels declared that the Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many. But He is even like the Jesus of modern reconstruction. Even the liberal Jesus taught a doctrine of grace. He taught it, for example, in the parables of the laborers in the vineyard and of the servant coming in from the field. In those two parables Jesus expressed His opposition to a religion of works, a religion which can open an account with God and seek to obtain salvation by merit. Salvation, according to Jesus, is a matter of God's free grace; it is something which God gives to whom He will. The same great doctrine really runs all through the teaching of Jesus; it is the root of His opposition to the scribes and Pharisees; it determines the confidence with which He taught His disciples to draw near to God. But it is the same doctrine, exactly, which appears in Paul. The Paul who combated the legalists in Galatia, like the Jesus who combated the scribes and Pharisees, was contending for a God of grace.

Let it not be objected that Jesus maintained also the expectation of a judgment. For in this particular also He was followed by Paul. Paul also, despite his doctrine of grace, expected that the Christians would stand before the judgment-seat. And it may be remembered in passing that both in Jesus and in Paul the judgment-seat is a judgment-seat of Christ.

In the fourth place, the ethical teaching of Paul is strikingly similar to that of Jesus. It is necessary only to point to the conception of love as the fulfilling of the law, and to the substitution for external rules of the great principles of justice and of mercy. These things may seem to us to be

matters of course. But they were not matters of course in the Jewish environment of Paul. Similarity in this field between Jesus and Paul can hardly be a matter of chance. Many resemblances have been pointed out in detail between the ethical teaching of Jesus and that of Paul. But the first important is the one which is most obvious, and which just for that reason has sometimes escaped notice. Paul and Jesus, in their ethical teaching, are similar because of the details of what they say; but they are still more similar because of what they do not say. And they are similar in what they do not say despite the opposition of their countrymen. Many parallels for words of Jesus may have been found in rabbinical sources. But so much more, alas, is also found there. That oppressive plus of triviality and formalism places an impassable gulf between Jesus and Jewish teachers. But Paul belongs with Jesus, on the same side of the gulf. In his ethic there is no formalism, no triviality, no casuistry—there is naught but “love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control.” What has become of all the rest? Was it removed by the genius of Paul? It is strange that two such men of genius should have arisen independently and at the same time. Or was the terrible plus of Pharisaic formalism and triviality burned away from Paul when the light shone around him on the way to Damascus and he fell at the feet of the great Teacher?

Points of contact between Jesus and Paul have just been pointed out in detail, and the list of resemblance could be greatly increased. The likeness of Paul to Jesus extends even to those features which appear in the Jesus of modern liberalism. What is more impressive, however, than all similarity in detail is the similarity in the two persons taken each as a whole. The Gospels are more than a collection of sayings and anecdotes; the Pauline Epistles are more than a collection of reasoned discussions. In the Gospels, a person is revealed, and another person in the Epistles. And the two persons belong together. It is impossible to establish that fact fully by detailed argument any more than it is possible to explain exactly why any two persons are friends to-day. But the fact is plain to any sympathetic reader. The writer of the Pauline Epistles would have been at home in the company of Jesus of Nazareth.

What then was the true relation between Paul and Jesus? It has been shown that Paul regarded himself as a disciple of Jesus, that he was so regarded by those who had been Jesus' friends, that he had abundant opportunity for acquainting himself with Jesus' words and deeds, that he does refer to them occasionally, that he could have done so oftener if he had desired, that the imitation of Jesus found a place in his life, and that his likeness to Jesus extends even to those elements in Jesus' life and teaching which are accepted by modern naturalistic criticism as authentic. At this point the problem is left by the great mass of recent investigators. Wrede is thought to be refuted already; the investigator triumphantly writes his Q. E. D., and passes on to something else.

The details of Jesus' earthly ministry no doubt had an important place in the thinking of Paul. But they were important, not as an end in them-

selves, but as a means to an end. They revealed the character of Jesus; they showed why He was worthy to be trusted. But they did not show what He had done for Paul. The story of Jesus revealed what Jesus had done for others: He had healed the sick; He had given sight to the blind; He had raised the dead. But for Paul He had done something far greater than all these things—for Paul He had died.

The religion of Paul, in other words, is a religion of redemption. Jesus, according to Paul, came to earth not to say something, but to do something; He was primarily not a teacher, but a Redeemer. He came, not to teach men how to live, but to give them a new life through His atoning death. He was, indeed, also a teacher, and Paul attended to His teaching. But His teaching was all in vain unless it led to the final acceptance of His redemptive work. Not the details of Jesus' life, therefore, but the redemptive acts of death and resurrection are at the center of the religion of Paul. The teaching and example of Jesus, according to Paul, are valuable only as a means to an end, valuable in order that through a revelation of Jesus' character saving faith may be induced, and valuable thereafter in order that the saving work may be brought to its fruition in holy living. But all that Jesus said and did was for the purpose of the Cross. "He loved me," says Paul, "and gave Himself for me." There is the heart and core of the religion of Paul.

Jesus, according to Paul, therefore, was not a teacher, but a Redeemer. But was Paul right? Was Jesus really a Redeemer, or was He only a teacher? If He was only a teacher, then Paul was no true follower of His. For in that case, Paul has missed the true import of Jesus' life. Compared with that one central error, small importance is to be attributed to the influence which Jesus may have exerted upon Paul here and there. Wrede, therefore, was exactly right in his formulation of the question. Paul regarded Jesus as a Redeemer. If Jesus was not a Redeemer, then Paul was no true follower of Jesus, but the founder of a new religion. The liberal theologians have tried to avoid the issue. They have pointed out exaggerations; they have traced the influence of Jesus upon Paul in detail; they have distinguished religion from theology, and abandoning the theology of Paul they have sought to derive his religion from Jesus of Nazareth. It is all very learned and very eloquent. But it is also entirely futile. Despite the numerous monographs on "Jesus and Paul," Wrede was entirely correct. He was correct, that is, not in his conclusions, but in his statement of the question. He was correct in his central contention—Paul was no true disciple of the "liberal Jesus." If Jesus was what the liberal theologians represent Him as being—a teacher of righteousness, a religious genius, a guide on the way to God—then not Jesus but Paul was the true founder of historic Christianity. For historic Christianity, like the religion of Paul, is a religion of redemption.

.

PAUL AND JESUS

William Morgan

How DOES THE GOSPEL of Paul stand related to that of Jesus? The far-reaching character of this question no one will dispute. From the point of view of the history of our Christian religion it is by far the most important that can be raised: in it the whole problem of the origin of historical Christianity is summed up. And its dogmatic importance is hardly less. The contrast which the Pauline gospel with its complex constructions presents to the simple gospel of Jesus raises the question as to the place and right of these constructions in our Christian religion, the place and right of speculative constructions in general. It is the historical problem that must first engage our attention.

1. In Paul we meet with a fully elaborated doctrine of redemption of which Jesus can scarcely be said to know anything at all. The apocalyptic redemption of the last days is, indeed, common to both; but what of that redemption from the Law and from sin in the flesh which for the Apostle constitutes the meaning of the Cross and the basis of his gospel? Nowhere does Jesus contemplate such a deliverance as the result either of His life or of His death. Never is the Law treated by Him as a uniform magnitude which must stand or fall as a whole, and as possessing only a temporary validity. With a sovereign freedom He rejects, deepens, enlarges, wherever it contradicts or falls short of His own inward perception of the divine will; and in the new form He gives it He assumes and indeed asserts its abiding character. With its central principle of recompense He finds no fault; nor does He betray the slightest consciousness that this principle limits in any way the freedom of God's forgiving love. Of the Pauline doctrine that God can justify or forgive only after the vicarious payment of the penalty demanded by a violated Law there is no trace. Forgiveness has no other ground than the royal goodness that is kind to the unthankful and the evil. Jesus proclaims the divine mercy as something that is always in the heavens; and as God's representative He can bestow forgiveness without a hint of a coming event, apart from which the forgiveness would not be valid.

And of an objective redemption from the power of sin Jesus knows as little as of a redemption from the Law. So far from sharing Paul's pessimistic estimate of the natural man, He appeals to him with a confidence that is rooted in a splendid optimism. Repentance and the attainment of

From *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, Edinburgh, 1917, pp. 252-66. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, T. & T. Clark.

the new righteousness are frankly staked on man's ability to follow the higher when he finds it. This does not mean that Jesus ignores the initiative of God in salvation or His ever-present help. He speaks of the shepherd going out to seek the lost sheep, and prays for Peter that his faith fail not. But what we do not find is the doctrine that the powers of evil must first be broken in objective fashion before man is in a position to fulfil the divine requirements.

To His death Jesus is far from attaching the same exclusive significance it receives in Paul. If toward the close of His career He speaks of a divine necessity that He should suffer and of giving His life as a ransom, He can also describe His mission as being to preach the gospel, to bring the Law to its fulfilment, to call sinners to repentance, to seek the lost. And in His words about His death He has no thought of formulating a doctrine of redemption, but only of giving expression—under the one form which Jewish thought provided—to His invincible trust that the tragedy which seemed to His disciples the end of all things, would in the Providence of God contribute to the ultimate victory of His cause.

2. Paul's doctrine of redemption carries with it a series of presuppositions and corollaries, and these also, as we should expect, have nothing to correspond with them in the teaching of Jesus. Where among Jesus' words do we find the suggestion, that hitherto Israel had known God only as lawgiver and judge, and that His own death would for the first time open a way for the experience of God's grace and give men the right to call God Father? Jesus has no doctrine of adoption. For Him every man is a child of God, though so long as he wanders in sin he is a lost child; and his task is to live as a child of God by trusting God and being generous and merciful as He is. Where again do we find in Jesus that absolute condemnation of our human nature so characteristic of the Apostle's theology? Jesus has no doctrine of human depravity. He takes men as He finds them, seeing the evil in them and condemning it, seeing also the good and welcoming it. If He will call none good in the absolute sense save One, He knows of such as are merciful, generous and strong in faith, and that without any suggestion of their having been redeemed. The many travel the broad road; but all can repent and enter the strait gate. Still again, there is nothing in Jesus' teaching to correspond with the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit. Human goodness is traced not to the Spirit's supernatural operations, but to the human heart and will. Among other auxiliary redemption conceptions foreign to Jesus we may mention that of sin as having its seat in the flesh, the connection of sin with the Law, election and reprobation, the bondage and liberation of the material creation.

3. How vital to Paul's gospel is the element of Christology and how fully developed one does not need to say. His gospel, if the story of redemption, is also the story of the pre-existent Son of God, the mediator in the work of creation, who descended into our world, clothing Himself in human flesh, and, His task completed, was exalted to divine honour

and power. And it is Paul's sense of standing in a vital relation with this exalted Christ that is the mainspring of his piety.

It would be wrong to say that in the teaching of Jesus there is nothing that can be called Christology. Jesus shared the messianic expectation of His people. And although the fact is denied by Wrede, Wellhausen and others, there can hardly be a doubt that He thought of Himself as the Messiah of promise. How exactly He conceived of this figure is a question not easily answered. Sometimes He attaches to Old Testament passages in which the work of the Messiah is described as human and ethical in character. But as it became clear that the Kingdom was not to come as the result of His earthly ministry, His thoughts seem to have turned to the transcendent Messiah of Apocalyptic who at the close of the age would descend with the clouds of heaven. He speaks of His reappearance after death in heavenly glory. This much of Christology we find in Jesus, but of the characteristic doctrines of Paul not a trace. Nowhere does He speak of His pre-existence, or of having created the world, or of a surrender of heavenly glory and an assumption of human flesh. The Pauline conception of a mediator between God and creation, God and man, is altogether foreign to Him. He leads men to the Father and teaches them to expect everything from the Father's mercy and goodness. Most important fact of all, Jesus founded no Christ-cult. Nowhere does He offer Himself as an object of worship, or indicate that He will become such when exalted to the messianic throne. If He calls men to Himself and requires of them a loyalty to which on occasion the most sacred natural ties must be sacrificed, it is because He knows Himself the representative and leader of God's cause in the decisive hour of the world's history. Of Jesus' gospel Christology forms no vital part. This is placed beyond question when we take into account the condition he attaches to salvation.

4. For Paul the one condition of salvation is faith, the faith that has for its object the Redeemer and His redemption. It is true that in the last resort what Paul understands by such faith is trust in the sin-forgiving grace of God. But it is also true that the grace of God has no meaning for him apart from the redemption drama. A series of speculative constructions—the incarnation, the abrogation of the Law, the destruction of sin in the flesh, the communication of the Spirit, the exaltation of Jesus to the dignity of Kyrios—is made the basis of religion.

That in the teaching of Jesus it is otherwise is a fact that can neither be denied nor explained away. Never does Jesus put forward His messianic dignity as the ground of His proclamation, or require a recognition of it as the condition of discipleship. In His interviews with individuals the messianic question never emerges. To the rich young man who asks how he may attain to life He replies, Keep the commandments; and when His reply is treated as insufficient, He imposes another commandment harder than any known to the Decalogue. "This do and thou shalt live"—that is no piece of irony, but a typical statement of Jesus' conception of the way of life. Not that He overlooks the importance of faith. Trust in God is the source of that elevation above worldly anxieties that

makes untroubled obedience possible, the source also of spiritual power—"all things are possible to him that believeth." But what He means by faith is always such trust: never the acceptance of doctrinal constructions. If sometimes He relates faith to His own person, what He has in view is not a recognition of His dignity or of the significance of the death He is to die; it is trust in the mighty power of God that works through Him.

5. Foreign to Jesus is also the strain of mysticism that forms so distinctive an element in the piety of His Apostle. The piety of Jesus moves throughout in personal and ethical relations.

6. For those who find in Paul a pronounced sacramentarian strain this must appear as one of the most outstanding of the differences between him and the Master. But rejecting as we do such a view of his teaching we must dismiss it as non-existent. Jesus did not condemn ritual in itself; on the contrary, He observed such parts of the Law as seemed to Him capable of expressing or nourishing any real religious impulse. And if He cannot be regarded as having instituted the Christian sacraments, there is nothing in these as interpreted by Paul that is out of harmony with the spirit of His religion.

But if the differences between the teaching of Paul and that of Jesus are undeniable, not less so are the agreements. And indeed one can say that the latter are more radical and far-reaching than the former, and for the most part underlie the former. Since, however, they relate not so much to the domain of doctrine as to that of spirit and motive, they are much less easy to formulate.

1. Only minor importance can be attached to the fact that the thought of both Master and Apostle is largely dominated by the apocalyptic outlook. This element represents not what is original in one or the other, but only what is traditional. It may be remarked in passing that while Paul is deeply tinged with the pessimism in which Apocalyptic was rooted, the native purity and force of Jesus' spirit preserve Him unaffected. To Jesus creation appeals not as sighing for liberation from the bondage of corruption, but as instinct with the Providence of a God who feeds the sparrows and clothes with beauty the lilies of the field.

2. Fundamental to every religion is its conception of God; and with respect to this we can say that Master and Apostle are substantially at one. Of Jesus' conception the unapproachable greatness lies in its combination of the character of severity with that of tenderness. God is the Lord of heaven and earth, the power behind the moral law, the sovereign and judge who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell, before whose eye we continually stand, and to whom we must answer for even the secret motions of our heart. And He is also the Father of mercy and grace, kind to the unthankful and evil, who does not willingly consent to lose even one of His children and who in His wondrous love goes out to seek and save the lost. His justice and His mercy go hand in hand; justice clothing mercy with moral earnestness, and mercy tempering justice so that it shall

be something else than a devouring fire, and establishing for it as end a kingdom of the redeemed.

While it is true that in Paul's teaching these attributes are set over-against each other in a temporal scheme foreign to Jesus, they none the less burn with steady radiance and give to his religion its stamp and character. No less than Jesus, Paul brings men up before the righteous Judge who rewards every man according to his deeds. And what is it but the divine grace that is the foundation of all his trust and hope? In the revelation of grace he finds the essence of the new dispensation; and the consciousness of it vibrates in every utterance of his personal experience. When all dogmatic wrappings have been stripped off, the basal fact on which religion rests will be found to be for Paul what it is for Jesus—holy love the supreme might in the universe, at once the constitutive principle of the divine nature and the law of human conduct. If his doctrine of election leads the Apostle perilously near the point of setting the will and power of God above His moral attributes and of narrowing the love of God to a love for the elect, he himself is hardly conscious of the fact. The end to which he uniformly looks is an undimmed triumph of grace. "Where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly; that as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

3. Further we can say that Paul reproduces the essential notes of Jesus' piety, that in faith and love and hope Master and Apostle are one. In contrast with Judaism we find in both the same complete subordination of the ceremonial and statutory to the ethical. If Jesus can declare that the great things of the Law are judgment, mercy and faith, Paul can add that the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Both place the service of God in the service of man, teaching a perfectly ethicised religion. And both equally break with Judaism in their repudiation of the merit doctrine. The substance of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith is all contained in the parables of the Pharisee and the publican and the servant returning from the field. What we have in both cases is a piety of absolute humility and trust in the presence of the judging and sin-pardoning God. Finally Paul's sense of inward freedom as against everything traditional, statutory and ascetic is surely not unconnected with the sovereign way in which Jesus, trusting the inner light, deals with the moralities and ordinances of the sacred past. If the essentials of Jesus' piety are all included in the Beatitudes, we can say that there is not a single one of these that has not its correspondent in the Pauline Epistles.

4. The striking similarity of the ethic of Paul to that of Jesus has already been sufficiently demonstrated, and all we need do here is again to draw attention to it.

5. Even with respect to those points in which the Apostle seems farthest removed from the Master the influence of the latter is unmistakable. It is a departure from Jesus when he establishes as the object of faith a construction of Christ's person and work. And yet it is far from his intention

to exhibit faith as an act of intellectual submission, "an obedient affirmation of the preaching of redemption." At bottom what he has in view is trust in the grace of God that has come to men in Jesus Christ. For him as for Jesus such trust is the secret of peace and the wellspring of power.

Again, while it was not from Jesus that Paul derived the mystical strain in his piety, his mysticism is none the less penetrated through and through by Jesus' spirit. Death and resurrection with Christ mean for him a death to sin and a resurrection to righteousness and God; communion with the indwelling Christ, a communion with the eternal Power from whom every pure thought and noble impulse ultimately proceed.

It would be too much to say that under a new form Paul reproduces all that is vital in Jesus' life and teaching. Not to any single individual or to the Church as a whole has it been given to do that. But this we can affirm, that his gospel is not really another gospel. The God into whose presence he brings us is the God and Father of Jesus, and his faith and love and hope are the faith and love and hope of the Master. Of all the Apostles Paul understood the Master best and laboured most abundantly in His service.

How account for this mingling of agreement with difference? With respect to the former the matter will seem to many very little of a problem. Does Paul pretend to be anything else than an apostle of Jesus Christ? But, as we have seen, the question is not quite so simple. His disconcerting silence with regard to all in Jesus' historical life that lies outside the institution of the Supper and the Crucifixion, the paucity of unambiguous reproductions or even echoes of Jesus' words and his reiterated assertion that he received his gospel not through tradition but from inner revelation, constitute a problem the seriousness of which none conversant with the facts will be disposed to deny. Already the problem has been discussed, and all that it is necessary to do here is to gather up the results.

The agreement of the Apostle with the Master with respect to the fundamental matters of religion is too general and too close to be explained on any other hypothesis than that of dependence. Wrede's assertion that Paul stands farther apart from Jesus than Jesus from the nobler forms of Jewish piety, and that the points of agreement are sufficiently accounted for by their common Jewish heritage, must be dismissed as for the most part fantastic. In whatever way the Apostle reached his knowledge of the historical life and teaching, the facts compel us to assume that he possessed such knowledge. And his failure to make a larger use of the historical material though disconcerting is not inexplicable. It is due mainly to these two facts, that the object of his faith is not Jesus as He lived among men, pursuing His ministry of teaching and healing, but Jesus as exalted to the dignity of Kyrios, the present God to whom all power in heaven and on earth has been entrusted; and that with respect to Jesus' earthly ministry, all significance is concentrated in the two great events, the death and the resurrection. Nor is the Apostle's emphatic assertion of independence inconsistent with the measure of dependence for which we have contended. His claim relates only to his construction of Christ's person and his inter-

pretation of Christ's death and resurrection. With respect to the historical basis of his gospel, he definitely asserts that he had received—plainly from tradition—what he had delivered to the churches; and if he mentions only the death, the burial and the resurrection, we need not suppose that he regards these saving facts as exhausting his debt (1 Cor. 15:3 ff.).

Far more difficult to solve is the problem of the differences. Where shall we look for the sources of those elements in the Apostle's gospel that distinguish it from that of the Master?

1. Something can be set down to the fact that the gospel of Paul is to a considerable extent what the gospel of Jesus is not at all, a product of reflection and speculation.

Jesus is no theologian, and in His teaching there is nothing that can be called doctrine in the usual meaning of the term. The simple conceptions under which He brings His mission—to call to repentance, to preach the gospel, to save the lost, to give His life as a ransom—are not in their character theological. Against the genuineness of the one distinctively theological saying, that of Matt. 11:27 ff., objections can be urged that to me at least seem decisive. Jesus does not make His work a subject of speculative elaboration and as little does He make His person. If He thinks of Himself as the promised Messiah, He makes no attempt to define the conception, unless indeed in a practical direction. The task He sets Himself is to act the part of a physician and saviour, not to instruct as to the secret of His person or the nature of the process through which salvation will be effected. In the production of His thoughts, system, theory, speculation play no part. From direct spiritual vision He derives the truths He proclaims, and these truths appeal to receptive hearts as self-evident.

To pass from Jesus to Paul is to find oneself in a different atmosphere. The element of direct insight, the prophetic element, is far indeed from being absent in the Apostle's teaching; it is present in amazing abundance. But how much there is that is not prophecy, but palpably theology! Everywhere reflection is at work, everywhere there is the attempt to explain. Paul is in part an apologist and constructive thinker. He will demonstrate the world-significance of Christ and His work, and establish the truth of the new religion as against the old. His Christology, his doctrines of the flesh and of the Law, of redemption and of justification, are one and all theological constructions. Without question one main source of the difference between the teaching of Paul and that of Jesus is the presence in the former of a speculative activity that is almost completely wanting in the latter. The Apostle essays to solve problems which the Master never raises or contemplates. His theology is a new phenomenon.

In conservative circles it has been the custom to trace back at least the germs of Paul's speculative conceptions to Jesus, and to find in this origin their ultimate authentication. The attempt must always end in failure. Paul himself never pretends to found on words spoken by the historical Jesus. Of his gospel he declares that he received it not from tradition, but by an inward revelation.

To say that the Pauline constructions constitute a new element in the

Christian gospel is not to reject them as worthless. The theological task which the Apostle performed was one the Church was bound sooner or later to undertake. Sooner or later Christian men must have faced the questions, Who is this who has been to us what none other can be? What precisely is it that we owe to Him? If there was to be religious thought at all, a doctrine of Christ's person and work was inevitable. And only those afflicted with a blind hostility to theology will question the value of the gift Paul bestowed on the Church. To mention only one thing, it was the possession of the system of formulated doctrine bequeathed by the Apostle and his successors that preserved the Church from being engulfed in the maelstrom of Gnostic speculation.

2. Not infrequently the transformation of Jesus' simple gospel of sin, forgiveness and the Kingdom under Paul's hand is represented as due entirely to the new theological character stamped upon it. But this is certainly a mistaken view. The theology was a product of the transformation rather than its cause. What led the primitive community and led Paul to attribute to the exalted Messiah all the functions of Deity and to regard Him as a present God, was not primarily a process of reflection on the moral glory of the earthly Jesus or on the work He had done for man's salvation. The impression made by Jesus on the heart and conscience is indeed a presupposition of the new position assigned Him, but it is not by itself sufficient to account for it. Appeal is often made to the resurrection as the decisive factor in the elevation of Jesus to the throne of Deity. But all that the resurrection did or could do was to create or re-establish belief in His Messiahship; and between this and belief in Him as the creator and ruler of the world there lies a gulf that is both wide and deep. Only when we take into account the Hellenistic atmosphere in which historical Christianity was developed can we understand how this gulf was bridged. To Gentile minds the messianic idea, if not unintelligible, was at least foreign, and without any of the sacred associations it possessed for a Jew. Inevitably, Gentile Christians gravitated towards a conception of the risen Christ rooted in their own modes of religious thought and feeling. Christ was thought of as a God to whom prayers could be addressed and from whom all help was to be expected. He could enter into the believer's soul and impart to it His own divine life. In a word, He was thought of as *Kyrios*. And as *Kyrios* He became the centre of a *Cultus*. This development lies behind all Paul's Christological determinations. It is not the outcome of these determinations, but the presupposition.

And what is true of Paul's Christology is true also of his doctrine of redemption. Certainly his doctrine embodies in rich measure a real experience of salvation through Christ. In all its branches it is rooted in fact. But while this is true, it is also true that the experience itself was in certain aspects of it determined in its form by Hellenistic modes of thought and feeling. It was from Hellenistic religion that the conception of a death and resurrection with Christ and of Christ's indwelling entered Christianity. Nay, that the Gospel was preached not as the message of the Kingdom, its righteousness and its benefits—the gospel of Jesus—but as the message of a

completed redemption, was due to the fact that it was unconsciously shaped to meet the need and cry of the Hellenistic world.

As has been more than once pointed out, the transformation to which the Gospel was subjected affected its form rather than its substance. One change of ominous import has, however, to be noted. A series of speculative constructions of high complexity advanced into the centre of religion. Faith is directed not primarily to the Father of mercy and love, not to the God whom we know in Jesus, but to the story of the incarnate Son and His work of redemption. To some extent religion is made to hang on speculation. This too was the result of Hellenistic influence. The conception of a saving gnosis, which has for its content a philosophy of salvation, was carried from Hellenistic religion into Christianity. In Paul the evil effects of the change are hardly observable, but all too soon they were to disclose themselves. The consideration of this point conducts us from the domain of history into that of dogmatic.

PAUL'S IMPORTANCE IN THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD

William Wrede

WHAT PAUL HAS BEEN for the Christian religion can be comprised in three sentences:—

1. By his missionary labour he transplanted it to a new soil, the actual world of Graeco-Roman culture.

2. He not only lifted the Christian religion out of the narrowness of Judaism, but tore it loose from Judaism itself, and gave the Christian community for the first time the consciousness of being a new religion.

3. He was the first Christian theologian, and by means of his theology he decisively transformed the incipient religion.

Let us consider these three points somewhat more exactly.

Firstly. The missionary ministry of Paul mightily enhanced the impulse to the dissemination of Christianity, and laid the first foundation in the new faith of the sense of strength, the consciousness of a power and a duty to conquer. And yet this is not the most important thing.

When Paul came on the scene the faith in Jesus dwelt in a corner of the world; it led its quiet life on Semitic soil. When Paul died it had settled in numerous places in the real world of culture, and its centre of gravity had already been removed from Semitic ground. This geographical transference was of enormous importance for the unfolding of the new religion, and meant the opening of a way for its most eventful intrinsic development. By entering into the domain of heathendom the Christian religion necessarily undergoes transformation, assimilates much of the religion and thought of Gentile peoples, is constrained to revise both its apologetic and its propaganda, and so to develop new ideas and ways of life.

Secondly. It was not in Paul's original intention to set Christianity free from Judaism; it was the evolution of the work of his life which of itself forced him to such a step. This act of his appears all the greater, since he himself remains, to a certain extent, under the sway of his Jewish past. The practical man and the thinker, however, here join hands. What really accomplishes the rejection of Jewish rules of life is the idea, conceived and established by Paul, of the independence and newness of the Christian religion. Before him there was only a Jewish sect, which had gathered about Jesus; when he died there existed a Christian church, which intended to be the salt of the whole earth.

Thirdly. Movements in a theological direction were not unknown to the original community; the recognition of the Old Testament was enough to beget them. But Paul is still the real creator of a Christian theology.

The step from religion to theology is always of fundamental importance. It is felt at first to be a descent, from what is simple, immediate, natural to something complicated, secondary, reflected. But it is also felt to be a necessity, a set condition for the maintenance and progress of religion, and so far a gain. The significance of a religion for the world of culture depends on its assigning a part to the intellect, that is to say, on its generating a theology.

Even more important is the question what it was that Paul the theologian effected; *how* he remoulded the new religion. The least part of it is his introduction of a considerable rabbinical element into Christianity. Everything on the other hand, is said when we say he made Christianity the religion of redemption. True, we may say of all real religion that it is and intends to be redemptive, but it is not of this general truth that we are thinking when we characterize particular religions as religions of redemptions.

No one who set out to describe the religion which lives in the sayings and similitudes of Jesus could hit by any chance on the phrase "religion of redemption." The idea of redemption glimmers, it is true, in the future hope, the kingdom of God: but it does not belong to the essence of the matter. The emphasis fall on individual piety, and its connection with future salvation. But in Paul, on the other hand, religion *is* nothing else but an appropriated and experienced redemption.

That which redeems, however, is by no means to be found in man himself, but outside of him in a divine work of redemption, which has prepared salvation for mankind once for all. In ther words, it lies in the history which has been transacted between God and man, in the "history of salvation" or the "acts of salvation." Paul's whole innovation is comprised in this, that *he laid the foundation of religion in these acts of salvation, in the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ.*

If we are to designate the character of this conception we cannot avoid the word "myth." We do not employ it with the desire to hurt anyone's feelings. It is not, as we use it, an expression of contempt. A doctrine whose profundity has endowed millions of hearts with the best of their possessions, a doctrine without which such men as Luther, Paul Gerhard, and Johann Sebastian Bach could not have been, a doctrine which even to-day comforts and fills with peace thousands upon thousands of good and earnest people, a doctrine which has given the thoughts of divine love and grace and of human sinfulness their most powerful expression, such a doctrine we treat with reverence. But the nature of the thought that a divine being forsakes heaven, veils himself in humanity and then dies, in order to ascend again into heaven, is not altered by such considerations as these. To one who cannot give credence to it it is necessarily, in its own essence, a mythological conception.

It follows then conclusively from all this that Paul is to be regarded as *the second founder of Christianity*. As a rule even liberal theology shrinks

from this conclusion. But it is not to be evaded. For Paul it demonstrably was who first—even if a certain preparative work had already been done—introduced into Christianity the ideas whose influence in its history up to the present time has been deepest and most wide-reaching. Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm of Canterbury, Luther, Calvin, Zinzendorf—not one of these great teachers can be understood on the ground of the preaching and historic personality of Jesus; their Christianity cannot be comprehended as a remodelling of “the gospel”; the key to their comprehension, though of course sundry links stand between, is Paul. The backbone of Christianity for all of them was the history of salvation; they lived for that which they shared with Paul. This second founder of Christianity has even, compared with the first, exercised beyond all doubt the stronger—not the better—influence. True, he has not lorded it everywhere, especially not in the life of simple, practical piety, but throughout long stretches of church history—one need but think of the Councils and dogmatic contests—he has thrust that greater person, whom he meant only to serve, utterly into the background.

But this reshaping of Christianity was manifestly a precondition for his work of setting it up, over against Judaism, as a religion with a principle of its own. Without his theology of redemption he would not have been able to treat Judaism as a superseded religion. He preserved the new faith from pining away as a Jewish sect; he rescued it for history; but he did this by transforming its character.

Paul is, in truth, a figure grand enough to have a place in the world's history. We need not think for a moment of those special incentives and suggestions which an Augustine or a Luther found in him. What enabled him to accomplish the task of his life was that religiously, as well as intellectually and morally, he was an extraordinary personality; and no doubt this also, that he had not become a Christian in the normal way. The “revelation” freed him from the fetters of tradition in which the members of the mother community were bound; it gave him the power to make a new beginning.

Jesus or Paul: this alternative characterizes, at least in part, the religious and theological warfare of the present day. The older school of belief is no doubt convinced that with Paul it enters, for the first time, into possession of the whole and genuine Jesus; and it is also able, to a certain extent, to take up the historical Jesus into its Pauline Christ. Still, this Christ must needs for the most part crush out the man Jesus. On the other hand, even the “modern theology” is not willing to forsake Paul. Paul is rich enough to afford them precious thoughts, such as they can make entirely their own. It finds especially congenial Paul's fight against the Law, although the “protestant” element in that contest is readily over-estimated. But in Paul's own mind all this, without the kernel of his Christology, is nothing, and no honour paid to the great personality can compensate for the surrender of this kernel. As a whole Paul belongs absolutely to ecclesiastical orthodoxy, whether it preserves his views quite faithfully in matters of detail or not.

SURVIVALS

Donald W. Riddle

IF PAUL IN outward appearance came to the end of his life a disappointed, discredited, and suspected man, it is nevertheless true that his reputation in survival reversed all the tragic and untoward circumstances of his life and death. The modes of this survival, in antiquity and later, furnish an instructive example of the changed regard of this early Christian leader.

The first significant event insuring the survival of Paul as a heroic figure was the appearance of Luke-Acts. To be sure, its picture of Paul was only incidental and subordinate to the total purpose of that work. Its stories in which Paul figures were not told for Paul's sake. Nevertheless its service to Paul's survival was of inestimable value. An immediate effect was to create a memorial of Paul as a leader of importance. It is a part of the splendid art of Luke-Acts that its figure of Paul is one of noble stature. The subsequent effect was, perhaps, of even greater importance; it is largely due to Luke-Acts that Paul stands next to Jesus in usual Christian esteem. A further result, which operated almost immediately, was that this new portrait of the great apostle became the first cause of the collection and publication of Paul's extant writings. Of this more will be said presently.

Paul's survival was effected in large part by the status which his death as a martyr quickly won for him. It is not to be supposed that the highly honorific attitude toward martyrs which obtained in the time when there were actual martyr cults was maintained toward Paul soon after his death. The first known case of this was that of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who died as martyr in 155. But it is indubitable that from a much earlier time there was a highly reverential attitude toward persons who "witnessed," whether they merely "confessed" or actually suffered torture and execution.

It is of interest that in the development of his reputation as martyr Paul was associated with Peter, and that both thus came to be regarded as co-founders of the great church at Rome. This church claims that relics of the martyr-bishop have for these many centuries been in its possession; there is a well authenticated tradition of their translation from their first to their final resting place. The mother city of churches also has its relics of Paul.

Certain stages in the growth of this tradition may be cited. First, as has been pointed out, was the appearance of the figure of Paul in Luke-Acts. Next . . . was the collection and publication of his letters. Then comes the

From *Paul, Man of Conflict*, Nashville, 1940, pp. 167-81. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.

reference (made, significantly, in connection with a similar one to Peter) to Paul as a witness-bearer in the letter of the Roman to the Corinthian church. A later datum, in which the considerably heightened form of the tradition bears witness to the steady growth of martyrological detail, is furnished by the Pastoral Epistles, especially by II Timothy. Here the terminology is strongly reminiscent of the martyr-cult: Paul is made to refer to his "struggle," and the figure of the martyr's crown shows that the martyr cults were already disseminating their zeal. By the time that these pseudonymous letters were written and circulated under his name, Paul had achieved the status of the highly venerated martyr. This was very effective in extending his influence in subsequent Christianity.

Of course, the most tangible form of Paul's survival was the use of his letters as part of early Christian literature. This was something which he had not envisaged. He never regarded what he wrote as more than an inadequate substitute for a personal visit, written only because the visit was impossible. However, it is a fortunate accident that some of his letters were preserved. Presumably their preservation must ultimately be credited to the churches to which they were written. But not all the churches kept all their letters; those preserved are only a fraction of what Paul wrote. The total number of his letters is unknown.

The view has recently been set forth that the collection and publication of Paul's letters was an act of a certain Christian leader in the latter years of Domitian's reign. The impulse seems to have been the appearance of Luke-Acts, with its heroic figure of Paul. Immediately afterward came the reference in I Clement; certainly from this point Christian writings exhibit knowledge and use of the collection. Their collector, in reading such of Paul's letters as were available to him, was deeply impressed as he read these letters together. The stories about Paul then made known by Luke-Acts impelled him to collect all the letters that could be found. Gathering these several together, their collector made the momentous discovery that when Paul's letters are read together they have a message which they lack when each is read only by itself. He discovered that when read together they have a message for all the churches, or, to use the conception which was only then coming into being, for the Church.

The collector did not stop with assembling such of Paul's letters as he could find. He published them as a collection. He had succeeded in locating letters to seven churches. There were more than seven letters; some churches had more than one. A certain amount of editing was necessary; letters to a given church were placed together, a suitable order of the letters was arranged, and the collected letters written upon two papyrus rolls.

The second great act which he performed, according to this view, was the writing and publishing, together with the letters to the seven churches, of a general introductory covering letter. This is what later became known as the Letter to the Ephesians. The Ephesian residence of the collector, and the Ephesian provenance of the published collection, were, indeed, important factors. Ephesus had been the center of Paul's most important activity; in a special sense Ephesian Christianity had a unique claim upon

the memory of the great apostle. It was entirely fitting, therefore, that some Ephesian leader rose to the great perception basic to his act: that when read together—as a book—Paul's letters have a mighty message for the church as a whole. This act was of inestimable effect upon the subsequent use of the letters, and, incidentally, for the survival of Paul as a Christian leader.

It followed from this that when early Christian writings were collected and used as Scripture, Paul's letters formed the primary part of each New Testament. Certainly when such collections were made, from the middle of the second century, Paul's letters were a constant element in them. It has been mentioned that although Justin Martyr does not cite Paul's name, he used his letters extensively. When a group of Christians in North Africa were being examined by a magistrate, upon being asked what they had in a certain chest they said, "Books which are called gospels, and letters of a good man, Paul." And when the first New Testament was formed and issued, by Marcion, it consisted of one gospel and Paul's letters.

In this process a number of Paul's messages were generalized. For example, the collector in writing the pseudonymous letter to all the churches ("Ephesians") articulated for Paul the conception of a grandly viewed bi-racial constitution of Christianity. There is no evidence, however, that there were at that time enough Jews in the Christian movement to justify the splendid figure that Christ's work broke down the wall between Jew and non-Jew. This idea was the projection of Paul's ideal, but not a picture of the situation as it was. Likewise the pseudonymous writer's plea for unity implies a conception of the Church as one organism, an idea never held by Paul. However, this author thus provides Paul with a conception which was worthy of the great apostle.

These same questions were raised a little later by diametrically opposed Christian leaders. The able thinker, Marcion, found in Paul the basis for an anti-Jewish movement which he furthered vigorously. It is one of the curiosities of interpretation that he derived an anti-Jewish attitude from Paul's letters; in doing so he missed completely the obvious pro-Jewish attitude of the real Paul. Both elements of the famous quip of an eminent church historian are true: Marcion was the first person in the second century who understood Paul, and he misunderstood him. Marcion proceeded by isolating one aspect of Paul's teaching, his message of freedom from Torah, and by doing so he drew an inference which Paul would have viewed with horror. Paul would have wholly repudiated Marcion's radical interpretations of Scripture, with its consequent total rejection of Jewish Scripture. Even though he was no rabbi, Paul would have maintained that all that was necessary to find God in Jewish Scripture was to understand it properly.

Similarly another Christian, probably a contemporary of Marcion, whose work is best understood when it is viewed as a polemic against Marcionism, based a second un-Pauline development upon Paul and his writings. Yet

he secured a hearing for his own work by issuing his letters under Paul's name. That is the significance of the Pastoral Epistles. When these maintain that "every Scripture is inspired and useful" they are making use of a highly institutionalized conception of Scripture, but their view is much nearer Paul's than Marcion's idea and use of Scripture were. Indeed, the circulation of the Pastoral Epistles under Paul's name was a very strategic move. Their author's quasi anti-Marcionism is plainly written upon them. It was a shrewd move to turn against Marcion the very source of Marcion's ideas. In fact, to whatever degree Paul was in eclipse at the middle of the second century, and to whatever degree "Paulinism" was at a discount, the Pastoral Epistles did much to effect a rehabilitation. They contributed greatly to his survival.

But it is a changed Paul who survives in them. The institutionalized Christianity of the Pastorals would have been recognized by Paul as an outgrowth of his labors only with the greatest difficulty. The substitution of organized and institutionalized religion for the original Pauline freedom and spiritism would have been regarded by him as a thoroughgoing alteration of essential values. The emergence of an ordered officary, with prescribed duties, would have seemed strange to Paul. Whatever he might have found in the Christianity of the Pastorals with which he would have agreed, it would have seemed to him a very different sort of religious life.

It is a curious and a pathetic fact that the attempts in the second century to apply Paul's conceptions and emphases were made by sectaries and heretics—that is, by leaders who were unacceptable to the main groups in the Christian movement, who were thus representative only of minority groups. Marcion applied the antithesis between law and faith, but in a way which made a gross perversion of Paul's relation to his people. Montanus made an application of the emphasis upon ecstatic behavior. But the Christianity of this time was so changed from that of Paul's day that what was fundamental in Paul's way of life was now frowned upon by the majority leaders. The men and women who, under the leadership of Montanus, did only what men and women had done with Paul's approval, were now disciplined by conventional officials. The writer of I Peter had attempted to keep alive the simplicities of the Pauline type of spiritistic experience, Ignatius of Antioch practiced ecstatic behavior, and a later interpreter ascribed the same spiritual gift to the martyr Polycarp. But there were not enough heroes to make this behavior typical and therefore a respectable pattern for the masses of Christians. Paul's memory survived, but his way of the religious life did not.

Modern Christianity, of course, points to the sense of sin as represented in Augustine's *Confessions* as a later formulation of Pauline values. But whatever minor similarities there may be must not preclude the recognition of major differences. Augustine expects that the sense of sin will be followed by confession, penance, and absolution—regularized offices of the Church. Augustine's *City of God* is a long way from Paul's apocalypticism, and his churchmanship has nothing in common with Paul's evangelistic zeal.

Such survival of Paul as was effected in Lutheran theology and Wesleyan evangelicism may indeed be said to have grown out of the interpretation of Paul's letters. It is pertinent, however, to point out that these movements are among those which have given rise to current misunderstandings of the real Paul. They have overemphasized the theological aspects of his messages, and thus have made a theologian of the missionary. They have furnished the terminology and the patterns by which Paul's "life" is conventionally reconstructed: his "conversion," his "missionary journeys," his "teaching," and his "theology." The result is that so far from viewing the Reformation and the evangelical movements as outgrowths of the Pauline type of religious experience, Paul is understood according to the patterns of these movements. Thus in the modern world Paul has once again become all things to all men.

All of these considerations point in one direction. It is possible to understand Paul, but only in a consistent attempt to secure all the essential information from primary and secondary sources by subjecting all to rigid analysis according to scientific processes. Prerequisite to this is the willingness to recognize that the man Paul was not the same as the martyr, saint, and hero of second century Christianity, nor the figure of medieval or modern theology. The scholar must be able to recognize Paul in that figure of the ancient world who, in one of the world's notable periods of transition, took a significant place in the growth of the already ongoing Christian movement. It plainly appears that he did, indeed, put some old wine into new wineskins, and some new wine into old wineskins. But it is also true that he put much new wine into new wineskins. One may learn, in studying the growth of Paul's religious life, not a little which is instructive and useful in modern religious life and leadership.

THE THEOLOGICAL THINKER

Johannes Weiss

RELIGION AND THEOLOGY. Just as earlier theology concerned itself chiefly with the teaching of Paul, and saw in him above all else the systematic thinker, and even, from a one-sided point of view, the dialectician of hair-splitting logic, so now lately, with no less partiality, it emphasizes the religious personality, the spiritual leader and mystic. It is necessary to avoid both extremes, for they are both, in reality, errors. For the special characteristic of Paul is just this, that he does not distinguish between religion and theology, piety and thought, at least in that side of his personality which has been revealed to us. It is, naturally, at once to be assumed that he could be untheological, in prayer, in his loving care for the bodily and spiritual welfare of those given into his care, and in all the particular concerns of his daily work. But, if we may draw conclusions from his letters, the moments when he gave himself without reflection to consider concrete individual cases of life were far less frequent than those when he also through trivialities and purely personal concerns permitted himself to be led to the consideration of the greater fundamental thoughts of his inner being, and faced the individual under the general, the lowest under the highest point of view. And indeed, not only in the purely religious sense of *sub specie aeternitatis*, but in the theological sense that the individual becomes an especial example of the rule that from daily occurrences arguments may be drawn for the elaboration of the highest truths: the question of the meats offered unto idols is a problem of sympathy and love; the question of the marriage of virgins leads him to the wholly general exposition of freedom from the world; the question concerning circumcision, especially, forces him to think through the nature of faith and of religion as such. The predominance of general and abstract concepts, the preponderance of dialectic forms of expression, serve sufficiently to show the essentially reflective manner of this thinker. Hardly has he begun to speak of the peace of God won through Justification (Rom. 5:1-5), than he entangles himself in a logical syllogism and contradiction (5:6-11)—the entirely scholastic suggestive relationship between Adam and Christ (Rom. 5:12-20) has for him a deep religious sense, and is, in fact, a confession of faith. In this way the dialectic explanation of the settling of the difficulty between himself and Peter (Gal. 2:15-18) passes over, unnoticed, into the tone of a confession of faith (Gal. 2:19 ff), and the joyful witness to the Resurrection of Christ (1 Cor. 15:20) becomes at once the medium of a theological

From *The History of Primitive Christianity*, Vol. 1, Elmira, N. Y., 1937, pp. 422-24. Reprinted by permission of the publishers, Wilson-Erickson, Inc., now Primavera Press.

deduction and exposition. The great Christological excursus (Col. 1:14-20) appears under the sign of thankfulness for God's benefits in salvation (Col. 1:12 f), and the other similar one, in the letter to the Philippians (2:5-11), glows with admiration for the humility that serves. Thus, always, religious feeling and theological reflection are joined in him; yes, even prior to this, we could not even represent to ourselves the basic experiences of conversion without at the same time indicating at least the changes in his theological fundamentals. He who would attempt to separate the one from the other would do violence to the nature of Paul. With all his soul and with all the power of his will he belongs among those who can really rejoice in an experience only when they have found for it a satisfying theoretical formula for its expression, and for whom, on the other hand, a consistent logical sequence of thought produces not only intellectual peace and satisfaction but indeed, and especially, a religious inspiration. Salvation must be at the same time both true and the means of solving the world's riddle, if it is to set him free inwardly. He is the outstanding theologian of the Christian Church; since Paul, religion and theology have been so closely coupled together in Christianity that it has not been able to break their alliance, even to the present day. It is very questionable whether this has been a blessing to Christianity. However necessary theology may be to the Church and her relationship to the surrounding world, it would still be very much to be desired if one could find in the life of the individual a religious form from which the theological might be entirely excluded. The modern cry, "Away from Paul to Jesus," the demand for "undogmatic Christianity," rests on the feeling of this necessity. The question as to whether the realization of this hope will be accomplished in our time or in the future, may be left in abeyance. But one means to this end is the knowledge of how in Paul the truly religious life is embedded in a hard shell of theological reflections.

The problem here is the same as with Paul the writer. It is certainly true that God gave to him as to few others the ability to express what he felt; but he is able to do so, for the most part, only by means of thought-forms inculcated by education, and which to us are strange and difficult. He does not always have at his disposal that impetuous directness and freedom of expression, which is a rare gift of genius. In this he differs from Jesus, whose simplicity, objectiveness, warmth speak to every child and have something of great value to say to the deepest thinker. Paul is rather to be compared with Luther, who for the expression of his deepest and warmest experiences had at his command only an inflexible scholastic instrument. However much he overcomes these hindrances, it must be deeply regretted that he had for the tenderest and finest of all that he had to say to humanity only that formula, for most people incomprehensible, "Justification by Faith." In a like manner, the thought of Paul, in the most important matters, is moulded in pre-formed concepts; he proceeds, for the most part, clad in an armour of theological ideas, even when he might speak to the heart of every age, and this at once discourages the approach of the interested reader who has no knowledge of Biblical language.

PAUL, PHILO, AND THE INTELLECTUALS

Mary E. Andrews

THE NAMES of Philo and Paul have long been linked together by Christian writers. Certain factors of their experience have made this a natural procedure. They are contemporaries. Both are Jews of the Diaspora, residents of famous intellectual centers, Alexandria and Tarsus. Both are thoroughly conversant with the Gentile life of their time and both are trained in Jewish lore, Paul in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, Philo in Alexandria. Both are of high social standing in their respective communities, Philo a relative of the Alabarch, Alexander, and Paul a member of a Jewish family which boasted Roman citizenship (Acts 22:25).

It is indeed a picture to capture the imagination, or was until certain scholars began to find problems where none had existed before. Professor Deissmann pulled Paul down from the high social status previously assigned him and placed him in the middle class of society, because his Greek, while good, was not in the classical style. He makes much of Paul, the artisan. It should be noted, however, that he leaves him a Roman citizen and a pupil of Gamaliel. In fact Paul remains an intellectual for many scholars who take the modern study of Acts most seriously and who have no particular apologetic bias. As long as the Book of Acts was considered historically reliable, even to the speeches of Paul, harmonistic method could weave a story of Paul that placed him in the front rank of learned Jews, and his boasted Roman citizenship strengthened the probability of his contacts with the intellectually élite Gentiles of his day. The fact of even a spurious correspondence between Paul and the Stoic philosopher Seneca points to the belief that it seemed appropriate to some that he should have associated with the intellectuals.

A few years ago an illuminating article appeared which deserves the attention of every student of Paul.¹ It is the first attempt seriously to question the probability of Paul's rabbinical training, although the author cites Mr. Montefiore's suspicion of the tutelage under the eminent Gamaliel. Hans Böhlig, who accepts Acts at its face value in the light of Harnack's early dating, expresses his conviction that Paul's association with Gamaliel was only an episode in his life compared with the influence of the Judaism of Tarsus upon him. He cites with approval Friedländer's judgment that Paul never became a genuine Pharisee. Professor Enslin has shown convincingly that Paul's training under Gamaliel is an assumption rather than an established fact.

¹ M. S. Enslin, "Paul and Gamaliel," *Journal of Religion*, VII, pp. 360-75.

Such results of scholarly effort decrease the number of similarities between Philo and Paul pretty materially. To be sure, Alexandria and Tarsus still remain unquestioned centers of Greek culture, Paul and Philo still remain Diaspora Jews, and Philo keeps his social standing and his reputation as an intellectual. But what of Paul?

I

Was Paul an intellectual by Gentile standards? This problem has not been neglected in the past, although there is no such consensus of opinion here as obtains in the matter of his alleged rabbinic training. In general scholars have limited themselves to the influence of Stoicism upon Paul. Although it has been suggested that Philo furnishes the most valuable materials out of antiquity for the illustration of Paul's letters, scholars have not turned to Philo to test Paul's range of cultural interests as an educated Jew of the Diaspora, reared in a well-known center of Gentile learning. That would be logical procedure, and there should be many points of contact and of similarity, even after allowance has been made for the occasional character of Paul's writings. The present study, seeking to discover the basis on which Paul can remain among the intellectuals, will use the works of Philo as a control literature to test the thesis that Paul belongs with his Alexandrian contemporary. It hardly needs be stated that from the mass of materials only certain outstanding features can be handled in a brief study.

The natural place to begin is to cite the certain evidence available on the education of each. Paul makes no mention of any experience with the mode of education prevalent among Gentiles. We know that he could speak and write good Hellenistic Greek, that his Bible was the Septuagint, and that he used figures of speech that betray intimate knowledge of certain phases of Gentile life: the Isthmian games, the gladiatorial combats, and the theater (1 Cor. 4:8-13). From the scanty remarks on his home training (Phil. 3:5-7, cf. Gal. 1:13 ff.) we may infer that his family sent him to synagogue school. These remarks would seem to indicate a family more than moderately strict in its Judaism. That he ever came under the Greek type of education is altogether improbable.

Philo, on the contrary had an excellent Greek education and discusses the subject of encyclical instruction more than once. He expects important results from the broad curriculum. Grammar, which includes history and literature, gives intelligence and abundant learning and teaches contempt for fables. Music aids the student to reject the inharmonious, geometry conduces to admiration for justice, rhetoric makes man truly rational, while its twin sister, dialectic enables him to refute the arguments of the sophists and cures that great disease of the soul, deceit.

Good as these branches are, however, they are only preparatory, the "handmaidens of philosophy," the milk that precedes the meat, fittingly typified by Hagar, while Sarah, the citizen-wife represents philosophy. Many men of course never care to go beyond the hand-maidens, they be-

come absorbed with poetry, painting, and "ten thousand other pursuits." But Philo was wiser. He espoused the handmaidens in turn because of their necessary contributions to the great goal, but he did not stop there, for as the encyclical studies are "handmaids of philosophy" philosophy is the handmaiden of wisdom.

There is no such knowledge of Gentile education revealed in Paul's letters. He says nothing that would lead one to suspect any broad acquaintance with music or art. His orthodox Jewish training would preclude an interest in the latter. Philo cites the work of the sculptor, Phidias, and discusses music at some length. Philo's social status with its attendant leisure would make it possible for him to enjoy the fruits of Greek culture which could so easily be denied to the Tarsian tent-maker. The Alexandrian would have little in common with his fellow-religionist if we may judge from his somewhat snobbish remarks on those "who are not purified, but are always talking foolishly, devoting themselves to the life of a merchant, or of a farmer, or to some other business the object of which is to provide the things necessary for life." His numerous quotations of and references to the Greek poets are another evidence of his broad culture.

Paul's scorn for philosophy is on record. He informs the Corinthians that his approach was not in "superior, philosophical language" (1 Cor. 2:1 ff.) but by a far more effective method which wrought great results (1 Cor. 2:5, cf. Gal. 3:5) which he attributed to the very power of God. To be sure, he shares with Philo the use of the allegorical method which according to the latter was not original with him, but "dear to the philosophers." But Paul's comparatively few allegories are in striking contrast to the exuberant richness of Philo along that line. Paul's whole use of the Old Testament was in line with the atomistic interpretation prevalent at that time.

Although Philo's veneration for philosophy is clear, he is not an adherent of any one of the great systems, but rather a representative of the eclectic tendency characteristic of Hellenistic philosophy as syncretism was characteristic of the religion of the period. Posidonius, "the most important figure between Aristotle and Plotinus," is credited with having started the eclectic tendency in philosophy, when he brought into Stoicism mysticism and astrology which ultimately gave rise to the philosophical and religious temper brilliantly characterized by Gilbert Murray's telling phrase, "a failure of nerve."

As the reader ploughs through the weary pages of digression on the numbers, six, seven, ten and four, particularly seven, he feels a bit dubious, perhaps, about the "sacred sect of the Pythagoreans" and their "excellent doctrines" which are a "new and hitherto untravelled path inaccessible to such as have no experience of moral maxims and doctrines building up systems of ideas which no one who is not pure either may or can handle." This line of thought definitely links up with the mysteries and their demands.

His debt to Plato, the "sweetest of all writers" is considerable. He quotes him on occasion, and certain familiar Platonic ideas crop out again and again

in Philo's writings. The doctrine of ideal archetypal patterns is one example. "For the beautiful things in the world would never have been as they are, if they had not been made after an archetypal pattern, which was really beautiful, the uncreate and the blessed, the imperishable model of all things." The *locus classicus* in Philo for this concept is his treatise, "On the Creation of the World." He is also partial to the vivid Platonic figure of Reason as the charioteer, holding the unruly passions in check, and the Orphic-Platonic figure of the body as the prison-house of the soul.

There is no such debt to Plato in Paul. Even in Colossians the terminology is closely allied to the language of Gnosticism and of the mystery cults, rather than to the more "philosophical" in the usual sense. When Paul talks about the body in Romans 7:14-25 he portrays a struggle between man's higher and lower natures. The connection of this evil inclination in man with the body (*sarks*) is in line with Hellenistic thought. It is the natural outcome of the changes that overtook Greek philosophy in the Hellenistic period. This line of thinking is much more in evidence in Philo than in Paul. Paul's idea of the resurrection-body and his whole concept of spirit are foreign to Philo. The whole basis of salvation is different by virtue of Paul's central idea of the indwelling Christ. Both Philo and Paul may conceive of "doomed bodies," but the outcome and the means of salvation have nothing in common. Paul's connection with Hellenism is on the side of the mysteries rather than on that of philosophical speculation. Philo once uses Paul's figure of the body as the temple of the soul.

Before passing to the problem of Philo's debt to Stoicism it should be noted that there is evidence of the influence of other philosophical systems in his writings. He adopts Aristotle's fourfold system of causation: formal, material, efficient, and final cause, and the famous doctrine of the golden mean. He disagrees with the Epicureans (as well as with some Stoics) on their views of the indestructibility of the world. He has much to say on wealth and pleasure, some of which may be directed at them, since most hostile critics of that sect persisted in ignoring the insistence of its founder that pleasure was not found only or even chiefly in the realm of the material.

II

Stoicism vies with Platonism for first place in Philo's syncretistic philosophy. . . .

We are not concerned in this brief study to enter into the minute details in Philo that trace to Stoicism. These are conveniently accessible elsewhere. Our task is the less ambitious one of locating certain familiar emphases in Philo and then investigating Paul's letters afresh to see if the same phenomena are there. If Paul belongs with the first century intellectuals, by any canon of logic they should be there.

The most outstanding tenets of Stoicism are found in Philo. These are the doctrine of the four passions—pleasure, desire, fear, grief, the fourfold classification of material (inorganic, plant, animal, reasoning) and the sevenfold classification of the bodily functions. The familiar concepts of God

as the soul of the universe, man as a "fragment of God," or reason as a fragment of the soul of the universe and man as a citizen of the world are all present, as well as the familiar "live according to nature." Where Philo is un-Stoic, as in his objection to the Stoic idea of world-conflagration, we find his Judaism the conditioning factor.

Certain treatises of Philo are outstandingly Stoic in content. In the book of the Virtues containing treatises on Justices, Courage, Humanity, and Nobility, and the treatment of the moral principles of the Law, the influence of Stoic ethics is very plain. There is almost complete absence of allegory in these sections. Other treatises that disclose an abundance of Stoic touches are "On the Virtuous Being Also Free" and the biographies of Abraham, Moses and Joseph, to mention only a few. These are very interesting. Abraham is the outstanding example of the man who arrived at excellence by instruction, Moses by being self-taught, and Joseph reached the same goal through practice.

Abraham gave attention to subjects of lofty, philosophical speculation. Philo's description of the good man is of such a nature as to preclude most of the human race. He is a lonely soul, who moved to the country to avoid visitors, and who makes poetry, history, and philosophy his companions. Philo's corresponding picture of the "bad" man has many points of contact with the modern "go-getter" type.

His picture of Moses is most attractive. Philo raps the Greeks for writing comedy and licentious works when they should have been preserving the records of praiseworthy lives. Moses had the best teachers the world of that time afforded, Greek and Egyptian, all of whom he soon outstripped, and by himself "comprehended by his instinctive genius many difficult subjects." Philo was probably thinking of Moses when he warns teachers not to take too much credit for the work of able students. Moses' education puts that of the modern university man to shame. It was broadly cultural, with the addition of Egyptian philosophy and mathematics, Assyrian literature, Chaldean astrology and mathematics. Of course all the branches of the Greek curriculum were included. What is even more important was his rare self-control. His behavior was that of a good Stoic. His language and life harmonized like people who are playing in tune on a musical instrument. Above all, he stood prosperity well—for Philo almost the acid test.

The ideal man in Philo's eyes always has this Stoic disregard of wealth. The good man looks upon riches, not as the perfect good, but only as a necessary and useful thing. They can be the greatest evil. He speaks of the love of money as a "terrible disease," present prosperity is a snare and a bait to be followed by excessive and incurable evils. Philo admires the Essenes for their emancipation from the love of money, and sees in wealth a fruitful cause of war. One of the most effective sections in Philo is his description of the way men abandon simple tastes in food, clothing and shelter to seek out the confectioner, the embroiderer and the decorators.

Philo deplors the necessity that drove him from his life of contemplation "never entertaining any low or grovelling thoughts nor ever wallowing in the pursuit of glory or wealth, or the delights of the body" . . . into the

"vast sea of the cares of public politics," but he is grateful that this condition is only temporary and that the whole of his life is not given over "to darkness." His experience as head of the embassy to the Emperor Caligula on behalf of the Jews would not serve to increase his desire for public life.

Philo's ideal government is a democracy under a constitution that honors equality, the rulers of which are law and justice. He uses the incident of Joseph's coat of many colors to carry the deeper lesson of politics. The public man, to borrow Paul's phrase, must be "all things to all men." He is one kind of man in time of war, another in time of peace; a man of vigorous resolution when dealing with a few opponents, persuasive and gentle when the opponents are a large group. Philo had the aristocrat's contempt for the "haranguer of the people and the demagogue." They, mounting the tribunal, "are like slaves who are being sold and exposed to view. They are slaves and not free men." "That every one should enjoy happiness without fear is the greatest possible bulwark of prosperity and security" is not a low ideal.

Philo's characterization of a judge is a picture to be commended in any age. He is "free from unreasonable passions, full of pure, unalloyed justice, a spring to those who thirst, has courage not to yield to supplications or to feelings of compassion so as to minimize punishment due to convicted offenders." The ideal judge will not listen to palpable exaggerations, nor hearsay evidence. He will scorn bribes, in fact the cases will stand on their own merits, he will not even know the parties concerned in the transactions. He will be thoroughly impartial.

No modern campaign speaker ever made fairer promises than Philo writes for his statesmen. His ideals carried into practice would revolutionize politics. For example:

... I have not learnt to be a slave to the will of the populace, nor will I ever study such a practice . . . And while I cherish these sentiments I shall be open to examination, concealing nothing, and not hiding anything like a thief, but keeping my conscience clear as in the light of the sun and of the day; for the truth is the light . . . And if I am called to counsel I shall bring forward such opinions as shall appear to me to be for the common advantage, even though they may not be palatable . . .

III

By any normal definition of the term intellectual Philo would qualify. His writings constantly betray the fact that he was thoroughly at home in the world of Hellenistic thought. We have found him discussing such subjects as the curriculum of Gentile education and the qualities desirable in men who hold public office. He quotes poets and philosophers, and reveals acquaintance with art and music. These are areas apparently unknown to Paul. Paul's scant reference to politics is an exhortation to the church at Rome to obey its temporal rulers for they are "ordained of God" (Romans 13:1-7). This was the attitude characteristic of Diaspora Judaism which had early learned to adapt itself to its environment in a way that Palestinian Judaism found itself unable to do. Paul scorns philosophy and its pretensions (Col. 2:8 ff., cf. 1 Cor. 2). According to the most generally

accepted chronology of Paul's life he went from Athens to Corinth. The Book of Acts states that he had not been oversuccessful in dealing with the Athenian philosophers (Acts 17:18 ff.).

There is an area where a comparison of Paul and Philo is fruitful, because the data are so plentiful in each. Both of these Jews of the Diaspora succumbed to the prevailing tendency toward mysticism. Philonian mysticism has been made the subject of careful exposition recently. The data thus ably analyzed point to a degree of intellectualism not found in Paul. It comes to light in the conception of God, in the function of the Logos and other mediators between man and God, and in the character of the mystical experience itself. "In solitary meditation upon the incomprehensibility of God, Philo experienced a mental illumination that was for him the vision of God. . . . For the time being, at least, the divine spirit replaced the human intellect, and the inspired man became a divine being."

This "intellectualized mysticism" of Philo is not found in Paul. But Paul's letters abound in references to mystical experience, but mysticism of a non-intellectual kind. Pauline mysticism was more crude in its forms of expression. Basic in Paul's mysticism was the possession of the Spirit, a divine essence that changed the constitution of man's nature, that made him something that he was not before. It was not a vision of God experienced in solitude, though it embraced wonderful visions (2 Cor. 12:1-6). The spirit came through an emotional experience upon hearing the message about Christ and his crucifixion (Gal. 3:2; 1 Cor. 2:3-5). It had endowed the apostle with supernatural power to do "signs, wonders, mighty works" (2 Cor. 12:12). Baptism seems to have played an important role (1 Cor. 1:13 ff.) but just what role is not clearly stated.

Paul uses the terms Spirit, Spirit of God and Spirit of Christ interchangeably. The vital matter is that the person is "in Christ," and has Christ in him, or as expressed by Paul's formula, "I in Christ, Christ in me." The necessity of becoming "a new creation in Christ Jesus" is emphasized (Gal. 6:15; 2 Cor. 5:17). Spiritualistic emphases are present in every letter, often obscured by the translation. Man lives in a demon-ruled universe (Col. 2:8-15). It is of fundamental importance that he be able to control these hostile powers. The Christian had a means of control by virtue of the indwelling *pneuma*. This whole area of thinking is very different from the mysticism of Philo. It is more highly charged emotionally.

Nor was this emotional experience limited to the few as in Philo. The whole Christian community was conceived by Paul as operating under the Spirit. A spirit-controlled community of spirit-filled individuals has no counterpart in Philo. There is ecstasy in Philo, but not the kind described in 1 Cor. 14:26-40 with its "prophets" and its "speaking with tongues." Moreover in Philo as in the Old Testament divine possession is not a permanent experience, but in Paul the spirit is the Christian's permanent possession. It is impossible to live a worthy ethical life without this divine addition to his nature. *Pneuma* is the prime condition of ethical achievement (Gal. 5:22).

Closely related to the mystical experience is Paul's conception of knowledge or *gnosis*. Knowledge in Paul is different from the meaning of the term in Philo or in Stoicism. *Gnosis* is not to be explained as a first effort toward a Christian or a religious philosophy. Rather it is a vision of God, secret wisdom won through revelation or personal connection with God. It connects closely with Paul's use of the term *pneuma* or *nous* (compare his "I have the mind of Christ"). These types of terminology abound in 2 Cor. 2:6-16 and in much of Col. 1-2.

What is there of Stoicism in Paul? As Lightfoot long ago pointed out, "It is difficult to estimate and perhaps not very easy to overrate the extent to which Stoic philosophy had leavened the moral vocabulary of the civilized world at the time of the Christian era." It is a matter of common knowledge that moral precepts tend to rigidity of formulation in the course of time. This is amply illustrated in Jewish and Stoic literature. The lists of virtues and vices were a conventional weapon with which to combat unethical conduct. They are common in the New Testament and in Philo. Most New Testament scholars acknowledge Paul's indebtedness to Stoicism in this area, for even if he received them through Judaism it was from such literature as had the stamp of the Greek spirit upon it. The dependence of Paul upon the Cynic-Stoic diatribe in the area of technique and method is also an accepted conclusion of New Testament research. Here is the contribution of Stoicism to Paul.

Does this put Paul among the intellectuals? It is difficult to disabuse our minds of modern notions of philosophers and philosophy sufficiently to realize the democratic stamp of Hellenistic philosophy which carried over into Stoicism. The popular street-preacher was Stoicism's contribution to ethical advance among the masses. This popular quality of Roman philosophy is indicated by Seneca who says,

There can be no doubt that philosophy has suffered a loss now that she has exposed her charms for sale. But she can still be viewed in her sanctuary if her exhibitor is a priest and not a peddler.

What would a Stoic sage have thought of Paul? He would probably not have been out of sympathy with Paul's powers of endurance as illustrated in 2 Cor. 11:23-32. He might have objected to his manner of recounting them. Certainly the true Stoic would have scorned Paul's outbursts of emotion in the letters to the Thessalonians, to the Philippians, and particularly in 2 Cor. 1-7. There is nothing of the "philosophic calm" about Paul. Seneca's ideal for the philosopher could never be attained by Paul, "The philosopher's speech like his life should be composed, and nothing that rushes headlong is well-ordered." Paul had little in common with the Stoic ideal of "freedom from passion, from every disturbing emotion, desire and fear, excessive pain and pleasure, anger, so that we may enjoy that calm of soul and freedom from care which bring moral stability and dignity of character." A Corinthian church service would be quite outside the pale of Stoic propriety.

The central emphases of Paul are lacking in Stoicism. The Stoics had no Redeemer-god, no cult-Lord such as Paul pictures in every letter. God was not personal, nor was there a future judgment to escape by God's acquittal. Paul's shortened world-view and the imminence of the end of the world are not duplicated in the Stoics. Both use the term "spirit" but they are poles apart in what they mean. Spirit to the Stoic was part of man's constitution as a human being—fragments of God—say Philo and Epictetus. Spirit to Paul was something that came into certain men as a supernatural element that changed their constitutions. Seneca's "holy spirit" that dwells in man, "who notes our good and evil deeds and is our guardian," is not akin to the Pauline use of the term. Paul uses the term in the same way as the magical papyri show that it was employed. It was not Paul's confidence in man that led to his conviction that the goal of Christian preaching was to present every man *teleion en Christō*. Rather it was his confidence in the power of the spirit working in even unpromising material (1 Cor. 6:9-11). There is no indication that Paul trusted the human reason to make of man what he ought to become. Nor did he share the idea that man was akin to God by virtue of his participation in the universal Reason (Logos).

Paul cannot be rated among the intellectuals of his day. He does not live in the same atmosphere, culturally, as a Cicero, a Seneca, or a Philo. But Stoicism touched his life through the humblest of its workers, the popular street-preachers. There was a very real Stoic influence upon Paul, though he might have denied it. Paul thought that the pagan deities were demons, yet he was deeply indebted to the technique of the mysteries with their graphic appeal to the emotions and their cult-lords. Weidinger is probably correct in his suggestion that current pagan ethical teaching went into the formation of Christian ethical teaching. It is only a step from the crystallized *haustafel* pattern back to the formulation of other teaching less rigidly schematic, but certainly not original as 1 Cor. 13 is original with Paul.

It is altogether probable that Paul's reputation as a highly intellectual man has had its basis undermined with the modern investigation of the Book of Acts. A speech placed upon the lips of Paul in the light of what we know of ancient historiography is not a very weighty foundation for the superstructure that has been built upon it. The fact that Paul wrote good Hellenistic Greek does not place him in the ranks of the *literati*. Amos in the eighth century B.C. wrote good Hebrew, and Abraham Lincoln in the nineteenth produced an English classic, and yet neither ranked among the intelligentsia of his period. Many of Paul's figures which looked beautifully abstract and theological are now known to be popular concepts, vivid and concrete. The real Paul will never be known until he leaves the modern circle of theologians into which Protestant Christianity has welcomed him, and finds his place in the ancient world of which he was a part. And that place is not among the intellectuals.

[THE MODERNIZING OF PAUL'S MESSAGE]

Amos N. Wilder

WE CALL ATTENTION . . . to the reasons for [the power of Paul's message] in his day. Paul . . . exploited the total resources, the heights and depths of his hearers' traditions. He touched their ultimate loyalties and possibilities to the quick. He convulsed their consciences and shattered their securities; in this aspect like the prophets:

Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth.—Hos. 6:5.

He made appeal to their sleeping hungers and faiths, and cast a torch into the explosive damp of the soul, of the Jew first and then of the Greek. It was in this sense that his message could be "in demonstration of the Spirit and power" (I Cor. 2:4). The sacred history of God's people, its covenants and promises were brought into play. He made appeal to the total world-picture and world-story in the hearts of his hearers, both in respect to its origins in creation and its goal in the new creation.

When Paul dealt with Gentiles who were not nourished on the Scriptures he appealed to their corresponding ideals and assumptions and the symbols in which these were current. The Greco-Roman world of the time did not, as in the case of the Jews, have a more or less common religious world-picture. It did, however, have its dream of world salvation, its idealizations of a world-savior and renewer. It had its bitter sense of cosmic bondage and cosmic tyrants. It too knew the tedium and flatness of a world that was old, and had its hungers for purity and immortality. It had its redeemer-prototypes and its ceremonies of apotheosis. Paul knew how to lay hold of appropriate emotionally-charged symbol so as to speak to the soul and the heart of the Gentiles, and to activate their deepest hungers. It is the more astonishing that he was able to incorporate much of his Jewish-Christian scheme and symbols into this Hellenistic context. What he did here in redirecting the message of the gospel to men with a different sense of existence is just what we have to do for men of our time.

Paul's message had power, in the second place, because, as in the case of Jesus but in a different theatre, the hour was propitious. The fields were white to the harvest, not in the Empire generally but in certain strata.

A lecture delivered February, 1948, at The School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, and published in the *Shane Quarterly* (April, 1948). Copyright 1948, The School of Religion, Butler University. (This and the other lectures given at the same time after revision will appear in book form with the probable title *New Testament Faith and Its Relevance Today*.)

Not only had wise men from the East, Aramaic-speaking lands, been ready to bring gifts to the infancy of the new faith, but also certain Greeks from the West were disposed to inquire concerning it. Professor Toynbee has briefly characterized the timeliness of the Christian gospel in this period:

The Christian Church itself arose out of the spiritual travail which was a consequence of the breakdown of the Graeco-Roman civilization.

. . . the Graeco-Roman civilization served as a good handmaid to Christianity by bringing it to birth before that civilization finally went to pieces.

No doubt many features of Paul's message of salvation and judgment if taken at face value are no longer meaningful or available to us today: the imminent world-end; the cosmology with its heavenly powers, the origin of sin and death in Adam. His interpretation of the work and person of Christ also seems very alien to us at certain points. One mistake would be to reject Paul *in toto* because of these difficulties. A more common mistake is to attempt to make a hasty distinction between what we consider elements of abiding value and obsolete elements. If we attempt this we are likely to come out with a few outstanding passages of Paul's letters like I Corinthians 13 or Romans 12 together with a few great conceptions, letting the rest go as archaic and useless. This perverse way of dealing with Scripture or with the classics reminds us of one-time interpreters of *Paradise Lost* who read the epic for its occasional "purple passages" and who set aside its "outdated theology" as mere scaffolding. In this fashion they disqualified themselves completely from an understanding of the work and its organic character, and from an appreciation of either the thought or the art.

To modernize Paul's message we must grasp it as a whole, though it may have to pass through a sea-change to reach us. In other words, it may have to die and rise again, the same, yet not the same. His paean to love and forbearance will still be there but it will be grounded in the condescension of the divine love. His universalism will be there but for those who belong to the new race and family that takes its rise in the cross. His great charter of freedom will be there, but for those whose bondage has ended through their participation in the great redemption.

So far as Paul's message coincides with that of Jesus we do not need to repeat. God's work is manifest. The powers of darkness have been worsted. The new creation is in course. All the inexhaustible resources of the creator are on our side if we are on his. The work of the Spirit point toward the ultimate transfiguration:

What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him.—I Cor. 2:9.

The realist asks if this is not a futile escapism as we look out on our world today and that world threatened by atomic war. We answer that this message brings home to us those possibilities of renewal in men that lie beyond our own assessment.

For every static world that you or I impose
 Upon the real one must crack at times and new
 Patterns from old disorders open like a rose
 And old assumptions yield to new sensation;
 The Stranger in the wings is waiting for his cue
 The fuse is always laid to some annunciation.¹

The message also recalls us to the faith and single-mindedness which through the church may be God's means for the preservation of the world generally from final catastrophe. It also reminds us of the great conception of the remnant in which the unhindered purpose of God can work itself out even after his severity, his strange work, is disclosed in calamity.

But Paul's version of the good news does assign a special significance to the cross and construes the role of Jesus in new and in what many feel to be extravagant ways. Let us free ourselves from the legacy of those who have hardened or narrowed Paul's thought in this area, the dogmatist, the systematizers or the emotionalists. Let us then try to approach Paul's utterances at the level where he himself lived, with a deeply imaginative view of the human condition, at a depth where life and death, fate and freedom, are at stake, a depth at which the knowledge of evil shows us the insufficiency of all shallow proposals of salvation. Let us then be prepared to give its due to the kind of world-symbol which Paul necessarily must employ to deal with such issues, symbol taken over from his great heritage. Paul like Jesus before him uses the meaningful images and conceptions of his tradition to interpret the present and the future.

Finally, let us keep in mind the larger frame-work in which we have sought to interpret the faith of the New Testament. The emphasis in Paul's gospel, as in that of Jesus, falls upon God, God's purpose, God's operation, God's goal. His view of Christ is always subsidiary to this. He offers us an account of God's saving strategy in history. But he leaves us freedom in our understanding of Christ himself. Paul is not interested first of all in what we call "Christology," or in distinguishing between the human and the divine natures in Christ. He is interested first in what God effects by him and through him. And even here he has no one fixed doctrine. He offers first one and then another view of what the death of Christ meant. He uses various terms for Christ and these terms point to various aspects of his work rather than serving as honorific titles. It is through Jesus as Messiah and man-from-heaven, as Lord and Son, that God overcomes the cosmic powers of sin and death and integrates a world marked by division.

If then we seek to restate in modern terms Paul's message with respect to its emphasis on Christ we could put it this way. Christ and in particular the cross was the door or narrow gate through which the race had to pass, and has to pass, to enter upon its fulfillment, or to enter upon the sublime Tomorrow which Jesus announced. Thus so far as men's life on earth is

¹ "Mutations," in Louis MacNeice, *Springboard* (New York: Random House, 1945), p. 17.

concerned the coming of Christ initiates a new history. But it is more than a new history, it is a new creation whose power and whose evidences are such that its final fulfillment is not compatible with earthly conditions. In making the drama of Christ's life the center of history there is no essential difference between the proclamation of Jesus and the message of Paul. Paul narrows down the focus more exclusively upon the cross. But Jesus had made it clear that the new age with its fateful claims was emerging in his activity. Arnold Toynbee has well pointed up the scandal for modern thought in the fact that the New Testament and the Church ever since has presumed to divide history at the birth of Christ, thus setting up "a dual back-to-back reckoning of dates B.C. and A.D., to apply to the whole planet and to all the peoples that have ever lived. He cites it as an example of the egocentric view of history.

This dichotomy of historical time is a relic of the outlook of the internal proletariat of the Hellenic Society, which expressed its sense of alienation from the Hellenic dominant minority by making an absolute antithesis between that of the old Hellenic dispensation and that of the Christian Church, and thereby succumbed to the egocentric illusion (much more excusable in them, with their limited knowledge, than in us) of treating the transition from one of our twenty-one societies to another as the turning point of all human history.

But we as Christians can do nothing about this scandal, though we recognize that many peoples have lived below the horizon of Golgotha, and have had their own ways of reckoning time. We recognize how foolish it was for the leaders of the French Revolution to begin their Year One on September 12, 1792. But nevertheless we believe it was right for the Christians to do this in connection with the birth of Christ, and later to read time backwards as well from this date. But this judgment of ours is based on faith, a faith which the dispassionate student of ethnology and universal history cannot always be expected to share. We see in the cross the narrow gate through which the race must pass if it is to emerge from its period of minority. Christ is the door through which the peoples pass from law to freedom, and from division to unity. It is proper therefore at least for this planet that time be reckoned from the birth of Christ.

Paul then sees in the cross the narrow gate of the new age. How can we make this persuasive to men today? There are two chief aspects of the Pauline doctrine of the work of Christ. They are briefly suggested under the formulas, Christus Victor, and Christ the sacrifice. Both are included under the larger text from Romans 1:17 with which we began: the revelation of the righteousness of God in the gospel. The Christus Victor theme has reference to his dethroning of the cosmic demonic powers which keep men in bondage, a theme forecast in Jesus' own proclamation. It is not easy to transfer the sense of this to our modern categories. It is true that men today are increasingly aware that personal freedom is inexorably limited by massive impersonal legacies, social dogmas and valuations which constitute fate for men and have as it were an existence of their own. This is what Paul was talking about in his own way in referring to the powers,

principalities, and world-rulers although his thinking about them pursued them right down into their metaphysical roots. Now to say that God dethroned these powers in the cross (Col. 1:15, etc.) is to say that Jesus had been able in his own personal experience to emancipate himself from these tyrants, particularly through his faithfulness to the point of death, and that this emancipation was made available to his followers. Thus the cross was the gate of the new age in this respect. By it Christ destroyed the old "world" characterized by these constituents, and man as he had been in this old world died with it. Thus a modern poet indicates the generalized or cosmic significance of the cross.

A gentle haggard countenance
Under black-thorns, putty-pale
Has hushed the planets' morris dance
And rent the temple veil
And flung the moving lance
Of a world-destroying gale.^a

Let us turn now to Paul's interpretation of Jesus as sacrifice or means of expiation (Rom. 3:25). This image cannot but mislead and trouble us if we set Christ over against God. It is when we place the death of Christ in the general framework of God's action in history that the image becomes meaningful. It is the character and action of God that the cross discloses. In Christ God was at work reestablishing the broken order of life. But this means that God had to find means to come to grips with, expose, make his impact upon, that disorder and self-idolatry in men that we call sin. That is, the bringing in of the new age was impossible apart from a fundamental moral transaction. The sin accumulated in social custom, attitude and value as well as the sin in the individual had to be challenged, brought to light, given a chance to see itself. This is what God effected by setting forth Christ as an exhibition of his own character and as "a means of expiation." The predicament of men could only be met in life, and not just by ideas.

It is often said that since the Renaissance modern man feels as his deepest need fulfillment of life, abundant life, carrying with it the great ideal of freedom. John's great texts on the abundant life and on the truth that makes us free are the favorite texts of many modern Christians. But we have here a misunderstanding. It is true that John Bunyan's Pilgrim flies from the City of Destruction crying out "Life, Life, Eternal Life." But *that* life is life indeed, life unclouded and jubilant, because it is characterized by the renewal of innocence. The greatest hunger of men, modern or ancient, is not for abundance of life or even freedom in the common sense, but for the removal of the shadow and weight on the soul which mar our peace. Our greatest need is for the renewal of simplicity, of innocence, not the innocence of Adam or the child or the Greek but the innocence of the new creation. Our moral failure and distress root back in our deepest being and in our fundamental orientation to God. Paul's explication of the cross

^a "Calvary," by A. J. M. Smith, *Poetry, A Magazine of Verse* (Chicago), April, 1943.

takes on significance in this context. His metaphors or turns of expression may not always be available to us. But we shall not find a solution to this final need for innocency unless we can refer it as Paul did in his way to ultimates.

That man's deepest craving from the earliest dawn of conscience to the present is for reconciliation and peace is well brought out in a poem by E. J. Pratt. The poem likewise suggests that all men's fumbling attempts at propitiation in a thousand cults and faiths point toward the meaning of Calvary.

From Stone to Steel

From stone to bronze, from bronze to steel
 Along the road-dust of the sun,
 Two revolutions of the wheel
 From Java to Geneva run.

The snarl Neanderthal is worn
 Close to the smiling Aryan lips,
 The civil polish of the horn
 Gleams from our praying fingertips.

The evolution of desire
 Has but matured a toxic wine,
 Drunk long before its heady fire
 Reddened Euphrates or the Rhine.

Between the temple and the cave
 The boundary lies tissue-thin:
 The yearlings still the altars crave
 As satisfaction for a sin.

The road goes up, the road goes down—
 Let Java or Geneva be—
 But whether to the cross or crown,
 The path lies through Gethsemane.*

Let us look now at the most difficult aspect of the matter as Paul states it. Christ on the cross represents us and bears our penalty. "For our sakes he made him to be sin" (II Cor. 5:21). "Having become a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13). "God put Christ forth as an expiation" (Rom. 3:25). Many today shrink at such language. They agree that Christ's love, even God's love, is manifest in Jesus' death. This may move us to compunction and reformation of life through pity and terror. But how does it give us any final guarantee of the security of good in existence? It merely suggests to us two forces at work in life, good and evil. No; that evil, that evil act, must be shown to have its place in the providence of the one God sovereign over all. Then we shall know that no tragedy is irremediable, and no suffering need be ineffectual. Thus Paul saw the hand of God in the cross. The point is that in some sense Christ stood in our place, represented us. It was not

* *Collected Poems* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1944), p. 20.

that he was a substitute for us or a scape goat. Rather he went so far down as to clothe himself with our condition. In him God's grace and our need met. In him God's holiness and our desperate moral distress met. The cross therefore discloses both God's severity and his goodness. The old world died with Christ and a new world was born. This was a matter of experience.

In any case, if we find such conceptions difficult, let us recall that Paul was using analogies very familiar to the whole ancient world. We should not press his metaphors too far nor stereotype them. But neither let us take too superficial a view of sin and its remedy. And let us meditate the theme that the sway of moral evil is not disturbed by ideas, but only by hand to hand engagement and vicarious suffering. But the evil that Christ met and overcame had a great generality and his work was carried out at the cross-roads of man's most significant moral and spiritual history. Certainly in the cross man's situation in its darkest as well as its brightest aspects is exposed and dealt with. The working of God is revealed there in black and white as it is nowhere else. And there God opened a door for men out of their impasse, a door opening upon a new creation and eternal life.

APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BACKGROUNDS OF PAUL'S TIME

MYSTERY RELIGIONS

- ANGUS, SAMUEL: *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
CUMONT, FRANZ: *The Mysteries of Mithra*. Kegan Paul, 1903.
FRAZER, J. G.: *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*. 3rd ed. The Macmillan Co., 1915.
KENNEDY, H. A. A.: *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*. Holder and Stoughton, 1913.
MACCHIORO, V. D.: *From Orpheus to Paul*. Henry Holt & Co., 1930.
PATTERSON, LEONARD: *Mithraism and Christianity*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1921.
WILLOUGHBY, H. D.: *Pagan Religion*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1929.

GREEK THOUGHT

- BEVAN, EDWIN, ed.: *Later Greek Religion*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927.
CORNFORD, F. M., ed.: *Greek Religious Thought*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1923.
MOORE, C. H., ed.: *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*. Harvard Univ. Press, 1925.
MURRAY, GILBERT: *Five Stages of Greek Religion*. Columbia Univ. Press, 1925.
NILSSON, M. P.: *Greek Popular Religion*. Columbia Univ. Press, 1940.
ROSS, W. D.: *Aristotle*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1924.
TAYLOR, A. E.: *Plato: the Man and His Work*. Dial Press, 1927.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE

- ALTHFIM, F.: *A History of Roman Religion*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1938.
FOWLER, W. WARDF: *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*. The Macmillan Co., 1911.
———: *The Roman Festivals*. The Macmillan Co., 1899.
GRENFIDGE, A. H. J.: *Roman Public Life*. The Macmillan Co., 1901.
HALLIDAY, W. R.: *History of Roman Religion*. Liverpool Univ. Press, 1922.
———: *The Pagan Background of Christianity*. Liverpool Univ. Press, 1925.
HEITLAND, W. E.: *The Roman Republic*. The Macmillan Co., n. d.
JONES, H. STUART: *The Roman Empire, B.C. 29-A.D. 476*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.
ROSE, H. J.: *Primitive Culture in Italy*. Geo. H. Doran & Co., n. d.
ROSTOVITZ, M.: *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford Univ. Press, 1926.
TUCKER, T. G.: *Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul*. The Macmillan Co., 1910.

JUDAISM

- ABRAHAMS, I.: *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. 2 parts, The Macmillan Co., 1917-24.
BELKIN, S.: *Philo and the Oral Law*. Harvard Univ. Press, 1940.
BEVAN, EDWYN: *Jerusalem Under the High Priests*. Longmans, Green & Co., n. d.
BRANSCOMB, B. H.: *Jesus and the Law of Moses*. Harper & Bros., 1930.
BURKITT, F. C.: *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Humphrey Milford, 1914.
CHARLES, R. H.: *The Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments*. Henry Holt & Co., 1914.
FINKLESTEIN, LOUIS: *The Pharisees*. 2 vols. Jewish Publication Society of America, 1938.
GOODENOUGH, E. R.: *By Light, Light*. Yale Univ. Press, 1935.
HERFORD, R. T.: *Judaism in the New Testament Period*. Lindsey, 1928.
———: *The Pharisees*. The Macmillan Co., 1924.
MATHEWS, S.: *New Testament Times in Palestine*. The Macmillan Co., 1933.

- MONTEFIORE, C. G.: *Judaism and St. Paul*. Goschen, 1924.
 ——— and LOEWE, H., eds. and trans.: *A Rabbinic Anthology*. The Macmillan Co., 1938.
- MOORE, G. F.: *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. 3 vols. Harvard Univ. Press, 1930.
- OESTERLEY, W. O. E., and BOX, G. H.: *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- SCHÜRER, E.: *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. 5 vols. Chas. Scribner's Sons, n. d.
- GENERAL BACKGROUND BOOKS**
- CASE, S. J.: *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times*. Zondervan Pub. House, 1929.
- : *The Origins of Christian Supernaturalism*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge*. Blackie & Son, 1929.
- CLEMEN, CARL: *Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1913.
- GLOVER, T. R.: *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- : *The World of the New Testament*. The Macmillan Co., 1931.
- HALLIDAY, W. R.: *The Pagan Background of Christianity*. Liverpool Univ. Press, 1925.
- MACGREGOR, G. H. C., and PURDY, A. C.: *Jew and Greek: Tutors Unto Christ*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

- BARTLET, J. V.: *The Apostolic Age*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- BURKITT, F. C.: *Christian Beginnings*. London Univ. Press, 1924.
- CRAIG, C. T.: *The Beginning of Christianity*. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943.
- DODD, C. H.: *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*. Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- ENSLIN, M. S.: *Christian Beginnings*. Harper & Bros., 1938.
- FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J., and LAKE, KIRSOPP, eds.: *The Beginnings of Christianity*. 5 vols. The Macmillan Co., 1920-33.
- GILBERT, G. H.: *A Short History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1906.
- HARNACK, A.: *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*. Vol. I. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.
- HELM, M.: *After Pentecost*. Harper & Bros., 1936.
- LIETZMANN, H.: *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1937.
- MACDONALD, A. B.: *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- MCGIFFERT, A. C.: *The Apostolic Age*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1937.
- MACKINNON, J.: *The Gospel in the Early Church*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1933.
- PFLIEDERER, O.: *Primitive Christianity*. 4 vols. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900.
- RAMSAY, W. M.: *The Church in the Roman Empire*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893.
- RIDDLE, D. W.: *Early Christian Life*. Willett, Clark & Co., 1936.
- SCOTT, E. F.: *Literature of the New Testament*. Columbia Univ. Press, 1937.
- : *The Nature of the Early Church*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1941.
- STREETER, B. H.: *The Primitive Church*. The Macmillan Co., 1929.
- VON DUBSCHÜTZ, E. V.: *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.
- VON WEITZSÄCKER, C.: *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*. 2 vols. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897.
- WEISS, J.: *A History of Primitive Christianity*. 2 vols. Wilson-Erickson, 1937.
- WERNLE, P.: *Beginnings of Christianity*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF PAUL

- ASCH S.: *The Apostle*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1943.
 BACON, B. W.: *The Story of St. Paul*. Houghton Mifflin Co.
 BAUMANN, E.: *Saint Paul*. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1929.
 DEISSMANN, G. A.: *Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History*. Geo. H. Doran & Co., 1926.
 FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J.: *The Life of St. Paul*. Boni and Liveright, 1926.
 GILBERT, G. H.: *The Student's Life of Paul*. The Macmillan Co., 1899.
 GOODSPEED, E. J.: *Paul*. John C. Winston Co., 1947.
 HAWKINS, R. M.: *The Recovery of the Historical Paul*. Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1943.
 HEADLAM, A. C.: *St. Paul and Christianity*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1913.
 HUTTON, J. A.: *Finally: with Paul to the End*. Harper & Bros., 1935.
 LAKE, KIRSOPP: *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*. Rivingtons, 1911.
 MACHEN, J. G.: *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. The Macmillan Co., 1921.
 MCNEILE, A. H.: *St. Paul: His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1920.
 NOCK, A. D.: *St. Paul*. Thornton Butterworth, 1938.
 QUIMBY, C. W.: *Paul for Everyone*. The Macmillan Co., 1944.
 RIDDLE, D. W.: *Paul, Man of Conflict*. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1940.
 ROBERTSON, A. T.: *Epochs in the Life of Paul*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1909.
 ROBINSON, B. W.: *The Life of Paul*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1918.
 SCHOFIELD, H. J.: *The Jew of Tarsus*. The Macmillan Co., 1947.
 SCOTT, C. A. A.: *Saint Paul, the Man and Teacher*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1930.
 SMITH, D.: *The Life and Letters of St. Paul*. Geo. H. Doran & Co., 1920.
 SPENCER, F. A.: *Beyond Damascus*. Harper & Bros., 1934.

PAULINE STUDIES

- ANDREWS, E.: *The Meaning of Christ for Paul*. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.
 ANDREWS, M. E.: *The Ethical Teaching of Paul*. Univ. of Carolina Press, 1934.
 DEISSMANN, G. A.: *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*. Geo. H. Doran & Co., 1923.
 DODD, C. H.: *The Meaning of Paul for Today*. Geo. H. Doran & Co., 1922.
 DUNCAN, G. S.: *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*. Hodder and Stoughton, 1929.
 EDMAN, I.: *The Mind of Paul*. Henry Holt & Co., 1935.
 ENSLIN, M. S.: *The Ethics of Paul*. Harper & Bros., 1930.
 FILSON, F. V.: *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense*. G. E. Stechert & Co., 1931.
 GARDNER, P.: *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913.
 GLOVER, T. R.: *The Mind of St. Paul*. Humphrey Milford, 1923.
 HOLMES, A.: *The Mind of St. Paul; a Psychological Study*. The Macmillan Co., 1929.
 HOYLE, R. B.: *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul*. Harper & Bros., 1928.
 JEFFERSON, C. E.: *The Character of Paul*. The Macmillan Co., 1923.
 KLAUSNER, J.: *From Jesus to Paul*. The Macmillan Co., 1943.
 KNOX, W. L.: *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1939.
 ———: *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1925.
 LAKE, KIRSOPP: *Paul, His Heritage and Legacy*. Christophers, 1934.
 MARITAIN, J.: *The Living Thoughts of Saint Paul*. Longmans, Green & Co., 1941.
 MORGAN, W.: *The Religion and Theology of Paul*. T. & T. Clark, 1917.
 MORTON, H. C. V.: *In the Steps of St. Paul*. Dodd, Mead & Co., 1936.
 NORWOOD, R. W.: *The Heresy of Antioch*. Harper & Bros., 1928.
 PEABODY, F. G.: *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*. The Macmillan Co., 1923.
 PRAT, F. J.: *The Theology of Saint Paul*. 2 vols. Newman Bookshop, 1926.
 RALL, H. F.: *According to Paul*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1944.
 RAMSAY, W. M.: *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*. Hodder & Stoughton, 1900.

- _____: *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*. Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.
- SCHWEITZER, ALBERT: *Paul and His Interpreters*. A. & C. Black, 1912.
- _____: *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Henry Holt & Co., 1931.
- SCOTT, C. A. A.: *Christianity According to St. Paul*. The Macmillan Co., 1927.
- STEVENS, G. B.: *The Pauline Theology*. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1892.
- STEWART, J. S.: *A Man in Christ*. Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- WALKER, R. H.: *Paul's Secret of Power*. The Abingdon Press, 1935.
- WEINEL, H.: *St. Paul, the Man and His Work*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.
- WOOD, C. T.: *The Life, Letters, and Religion of St. Paul*. T. & T. Clark, 1925.
- WREDE, W.: *Paul*. Philip Green & Co., 1907.

BIOGRAPHICAL INDEX OF AUTHORS

ANDREWS, MARY EDITH: Born West Newton, Pa., 1892. Educated Oberlin Col. (A.B. 1917, A.M. 1920), Chicago Theol. Sem. (B.D. 1926), Univ. of Chicago (Ph.D. 1931). Teacher in public schools of Westmoreland County, Pa. (1918-19, 1923-24), in Amazimtoti Institute, Natal, South Africa (1920-22). Teacher of religion in Goucher Col. since 1926, chairman of department since 1939, prof. since 1945. Her writings include *The Ethical Teaching of Paul* (1934) and numerous articles in religious journals. As a New Testament scholar she has emphasized the historical rather than the dogmatic approach to New Testament problems, including special interest in Paul as related to other thinkers of his century.

Paul, Philo, and the Intellectuals 400

BACON, BENJAMIN W: Born Litchfield, Conn., 1860; died 1932. Educated in Germany and Switzerland, Yale Univ. (A.B. 1881, B.D. 1884, A.M. 1892). Ordained Cong. ministry 1884. Pastor Old Lyme, Conn., 1884-89, Oswego, N. Y., 1889-96; instr. New Testament Greek 1896-97, prof. New Testament criticism and exegesis after 1897, Yale Univ. Among his books are *An Introduction to the New Testament* (1900), *The Story of St. Paul* (1904), *Beginnings of the Gospel Story*, (1909), *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (1909), *Jesus the Son of God* (1911), *The Making of the New Testament* (1912), *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* (1919), *Jesus and Paul* (1921), *The Gospel of Mark, Its Compositions and Date* (1925), *The Apostolic Message* (1925), *The Story of Jesus* (1927), *Studies in Matthew* (1930). Dr. Bacon has done significant work in showing how both the Gospel of John and the writings of Paul were vital in modernizing the gospel to the Hellenistic world. Of Paul he says, "Paul's experience was not so much that of a Palestinian Jew, as that of a Hellenist, one whose idea of 'redemption' has been unconsciously universalized, individualized, and spiritualized, by contact with Greek and Hellenistic thought. Paul and the Galilean apostles were not far apart in their expectations of the future. Both stood gazing into heaven. But for his authority Paul inevitably looked inwards, the Galilean apostles looked backwards."

Formative Influences, from *The Story of St. Paul* 106

BARNETT, ALBERT E.: Born Opelika, Alabama, 1895. Educated Birmingham-Southern Col. (A.B. 1916), Emory Univ. (B.D. 1921), Univ. of Chicago (M.A. 1928, Ph.D. 1932). Prof. literature and history of the Bible, Scarritt Col., 1924-43; prof. New Testament interpretation, Divinity Sch., Univ. of Chicago, 1943-44; prof. New Testament interpretation, Garrett Biblical Institute since 1944. Writings include *Understanding the Parables of Our Lord* (1940), *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (1941), *The New Testament: Its Making and Meaning* (1946), *The Letters of Paul* (1947). His stress in New Testament studies is to find through religious-historical method the values which contribute to effective Christian living for both the first century and the twentieth century. In several of his writings he has clarified the meaning of Paul as a personality who took on renewed popularity after Luke had written a biography of Paul in Acts.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, from *The New Testament: Its Making and Meaning* 215

BARTH, KARL: Born Basel, Switzerland, 1886. Educated universities in Bern, Berlin, Tübingen, and Marburg; holds degree D. Theol. Has been prof. theology, Göttingen, Münster, Bonn, and Basel; editor *Zwischen den Seiten*, 1922-33. Among his writings translated into English are *The Church and the Churches*, (1936), *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (1928), *The Epistle to the Romans* (1933), *The Resurrection of the Dead* (1933), *Credo* (1936), *The Doctrine of the Word of God* (1936), *Church Dogmatics* (1936), *God in Action* (1937), *The Holy Ghost and the Christian Life* (1938), *The Knowledge of God and the Service of God* (1938), *Church and State* (1939). He has been evaluated by some as the most stimulating voice in Protestantism since Martin Luther. He is an exponent of crisis theology, in which reason and feeling are ruled out as a means of knowing God, since God is known *only* in his revelation through Jesus Christ to men of faith. His thinking, much affected by Calvin and Kierkegaard, is centered in Paul. His *Römerbrief* (*Epistle to the Romans*) has been described as a "bomb thrown into the lap of the theologians" because of its tremendous stimulation to contemporary religious thinkers.

Jesus, from *The Epistle to the Romans* 270

BEVAN, EDWYN ROBERT: Born London, England, 1870; died 1943. Educated New College, Oxford Univ. (M.A., honorary fellow); honorary doctorates from Oxford Univ. and St. Andrews Univ. Lecturer on Hellenistic history and literature, King's Col., London, 1922-33; Gifford lecturer for Univ. of Edinburgh, 1932-34; archaeological work in Athens, Greece, 1894, and Alexandria, Egypt, 1895; worked for British government in various capacities at home and abroad. Among his numerous writings those related to biblical studies are *Jerusalem Under the High Priests* (1904), *Stoics and Sceptics* (1913), *Hellenism and Christianity* (1921), *Later Greek Religion* (1927), *Christianity* (1932), *Christians in a World at War* (1940). He belonged to that group of recent English scholars who did much to describe the Hellenism of the first century and to show how Christian ideology related itself to that environment.

[Mystery Religions and Christianity], from *History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge* 42

BOSWORTH, EDWARD INCREASE: Born Elgin, Ill., 1861; died 1927. Educated Oberlin Col. (1879-81, B.D. 1886, A.M. 1893), Yale Univ. (A.B. 1883), Univ. of Leipzig, Athens, Greece. Ordained Congregational ministry 1886. Prof. English Bible, 1887-90, Oberlin Graduate Sch. of Theol., prof. New Testament language and literature, 1892-1926, dean 1903-23; acting pres. Oberlin Col., 1918-19. Lectured in Japan, 1907; in Turkey, 1911. Author of *Studies in the Acts and Epistles* (1898), *Studies in the Teaching of Jesus and His Apostles* (1901), *Studies in the Life of Jesus Christ* (1904), *New Studies in Acts* (1908), *Christ in Everyday Life* (1910), *Thirty Studies About Jesus* (1917), *Commentary on Romans* (1919), *What It Means to Be a Christian* (1922), *Life and Teaching of Jesus According to the First Three Gospels* (1924). He belongs to that group of scholars who bridged two centuries, whose constructive liberalism in New Testament studies has stood the test of present day criteria. As an administrator and inspiring teacher, he has deeply impressed many individuals in both college and seminary classes. For a short and clear insight into Paul's concept of salvation by faith, his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is excellent.

Paul—His Religious Experience, from *The Epistle to the Romans* 141

BRANSCOMB, B. HARVIE: Born Huntsville, Ala., 1894. Educated Birmingham-Southern Col. (A.B. 1914), Oxford Univ. (Rhodes scholar A.B., A.M.), Columbia Univ. (Ph.D. 1924). Guggenheim fellow, 1931-32. Adjunct prof. philosophy, Southern Methodist Univ., 1919-20, assoc. prof. New Testament 1920-21, prof. 1921-25;

prof. New Testament, School of Religion, Duke Univ. 1925-45, dean 1945-46, also chairman division of ancient languages and literature 1937-46, director of libraries 1934-41. Chancellor, Vanderbilt Univ. since 1946. Member advisory council, *Religion in Life*. He has written *Jesus and the Law of Moses* (1930), *The Teachings of Jesus* (1931), *The Gospel of Mark* (1937), *Teaching with Books* (1940). Particularly of value in Pauline studies has been his accurate work showing the relation of the Christian tradition to the legalistic note in Judaism. [Jesus' Attitude Toward the Torah], from *Jesus and the Law of Moses* 75

BURKITT, FRANCIS: C.: Born London, England, 1864; died 1935. Educated Harrow and Trinity Col., Cambridge Univ. Lecturer in paleography 1904-5, Norrisian prof. divinity after 1905, Cambridge Univ. Among his more recent writings are *Christian Beginnings* (1924), *Christian Worship* (1930), *Church and Gnosis* (1932), *Jesus Christ: An Historical Outline* (1932), "The Debt of Christianity to Judaism" in *The Legacy of Israel* (1927), "The Prophets of Israel" in the *S.P.C.K. Commentary* (1928), "The Life of Jesus" in *The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (1929). Interested in the Latin and Syriac versions of the New Testament, deeply concerned with Christian origins, loyal son of the Church of England, he was "almost the last of a generation of English scholars which substantially advanced the critical investigation of early Christianity." As a Pauline student his main interest centered in the genesis of the apostolic movement and its relation to concurrent cultures. [An Ethical Anarchist], from *Christian Beginnings* 309

CADBURY, HENRY JOEL: Born Philadelphia, Pa., 1883. Educated Haverford Col. (A.B. 1905), Harvard Univ. (A.M. 1904, Ph.D. 1914), Univ. of Glasgow (D.D. 1937), Teacher of biblical literature, Haverford Col., 1910-19; lecturer on New Testament, Andover Theol. Sem., 1919-21, asst. prof. New Testament interpretation, 1921-22; lecturer on Old Testament Episcopal Theol. Sch., Cambridge, Mass., 1924-26; prof. biblical lit., Bryn Mawr Col. 1926-34; lecturer Pendle Hill, 1930-34, 1942-44; Hollis prof. divinity, Harvard, since 1934. Director Andover-Harvard Theol. library since 1938. Member American Standard Bible Committee since 1930. He is the author of *National Ideals in the Old Testament* (1930), *Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Part I, 1919, Part II, 1920), *The Making of Luke-Acts* (1927), *The Beginnings of Christianity* (with Kirsopp Lake, Vols. IV-V, 1933), *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (1937), *The Annual Catalogue of George Fox* (1939), *Swartmore Documents in America* (1940), *Jesus: What Manner of Man* (1947), editor of the *Annual of American Schools of Oriental Research* (1927-32). Through his contributions to Quaker thought, his keen evaluation of the meaning of Jesus for today, and his work with Kirsopp Lake on first-century culture, he has held a comprehensive place among American religious thinkers.

Concurrent Phases of Paul's Religion, from *Studies in Early Christianity* 255

CRAIG, CLARENCE TUCKER: Born Benton Harbor, Mich., 1895. Educated Morning-side Col. (A.B. 1915), Boston Univ. (S.T.B. 1919, Ph.D. 1924), Harvard Univ., Basel Univ., Switzerland, Univ. of Berlin. Teacher Anglo-Chinese Col., Foochow, China, 1915-16. Ordained Meth. ministry 1918. Pastorates in Massachusetts, Indiana, Ohio, New York 1918-28; prof. New Testament language and literature, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, 1928-46; prof. New Testament, Yale Divinity Sch. 1946-49; dean Drew Theol. Sem. since 1949; teacher in summer sessions at Garrett Biblical Inst. and Union Theol. Sem. His writings include *The Christian's Personal Religion* (1925), *Jesus in Our Teaching* (1931), *We Have an Altar* (1934), *The Study of the New Testament* (1939), *The Beginning of Christianity* (1943), *One God, One World* (1943). Member American Standard Bible

Committee. In his editorial work, his translation contributions, and his leadership in the ecumenical movement he stands among the leaders of New Testament scholars. No recent writing better shows Paul in the growing flux of the New Testament story than his *Beginning of Christianity*.

The Conversion of Paul, from *The Beginning of Christianity* 133

DEISSMANN, GUSTAV ADOLF: Born Langenscheid, Nassau, Germany, 1866; died 1937. Educated Tübingen Univ., Berlin Univ. (D. Theol.); honorary doctorates from Aberdeen Univ., St. Andrews Univ., Manchester Univ., Oxford Univ., Oppsala Univ., Wooster. Teacher in New Testament studies at Marburg Univ. and Heidelberg Univ., 1908-30; prof. New Testament exegesis, Berlin Univ., rector 1930-31; archaeological work carried on in Asia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt; lecturer at various universities in Europe, British Isles, United States, and Asia. Of his numerous writings the following are translated into the English: *New Light on the New Testament* (1907), *Philology of the Greek Bible* (1908), *Light from the Ancient East* (1910), *St. Paul* (1912), *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* (1923), *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research* (1929), *Mysterium Christi* (1930). From his careful study of Paul's religious experience, he has been a leading voice in discerning Pauline terms like salvation, justification, adoption, reconciliation as being synonymous expressions rather than parts of a step process in Christian salvation through faith in Christ.

[Where Paul's Theology Begins], from *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* 249

DIBELIUS, MARTIN: Born Dresden, Germany, 1883; died 1948. Educated universities of Neuchâtel, Leipzig, Tübingen, Berlin. Teacher of New Testament at Berlin 1910-15, Heidelberg 1915-48. Among his many books the following have won admirable attention in their English translations: *From Tradition to Gospel* (1933), *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (1936), *The Message of Jesus Christ* (1939), *The Sermon on the Mount* (1940). Of contemporary German New Testament critics he holds a place of foremost importance with American and English students, being particularly known through his constructive use of form criticism. In Pauline writings he has been especially apt in analyzing the types of literary structure in which the apostle's words are framed.

Paul as a Letter Writer, from *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* 177

DODD, CHARLES HAROLD: Born Wrexham, Denbighshire, 1884. Educated Wrexham; University Col., Oxford; Berlin; Magdalen Col., Cambridge; Manchester; Mansfield Col., Oxford. Ordained Cong. ministry 1912. Minister Cong. Church, Warwick, 1912-15, 1918-19. Rylands prof. biblical criticism and exegesis, Manchester, 1930-35; Norris-Hales prof. divinity, Cambridge Univ., since 1935; fellow of Jesus Col., Cambridge, since 1936. He has given many series of lectures at colleges and universities in England and U. S. His writings include *The Meaning of Paul for Today* (1920), *The Gospel in the New Testament* (1926), *The Authority of the Bible* (1928), *The Bible and Its Background* (1931), *The Epistle to the Romans in "The Moffatt Commentary"* (1932), *There and Back Again* (1932), *The Bible and the Greeks* (1935), *The Parables of the Kingdom* (1935), *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (1936), *The Present Task in New Testament Studies* (1936), *The Communion of Saints* (1936), *History and the Gospel* (1937), *The Gospels as History* (1938), *The Johannine Epistles in "The Moffatt Commentary"* (1946), *The Bible To-day* (1947). No New Testament scholar today has done more to wed New Testament criticism to a constructive note. His *Meaning of Paul for Today* remains one of the classic interpretations of the apostle.

The Ancient Wrong, from *The Meaning of Paul for Today* 263

DUNCAN, GEORGE SIMPSON: Born, 1884. Educated Edinburgh Univ. (M.A., B.D.), Trinity Col., Cambridge Univ. (B.A.), St. Andrews Univ., Marburg Univ., Jena Univ., Heidelberg Univ. Ordained ministry of the Church of Scotland, 1915; chaplain World War I, 1915-19. Prof. biblical criticism since 1919, St. Mary's Col. in St. Andrews Univ., principal since 1940; honorary prof. Reformed Church Col., Debrecen, Hungary, 1938, Bucharest, 1946. Writings include *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (1929), *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (Moffatt New Testament Commentary, 1934), *Jesus, Son of Man* (1948). He is a Scottish scholar who has been particularly acute in his vivid interpretations of Paul's theology.

[Critical Problems Related to Galatians], from *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* 219

ENSLIN, MORTON SCOTT: Born Somerville, Mass., 1897. Educated Harvard Univ. (A.B. 1919, Th.D. 1924), Newton Theol. Inst. (B.D. 1922), Colby Col. (D.D. 1945). Has been prof. New Testament literature and exegesis and head of department, Crozer Theol. Sem. since 1924; lecturer in textual criticism, Philadelphia Divinity School, 1924-25; lecturer in patristics, Graduate School, Univ. of Pennsylvania, since 1926. Writings include *The Ethics of Paul* (1930), *Christian Beginnings* (1938); *God, the Eternal Torment of Man* (translated from the French of Marc Boegner, 1931). Editor *Crozer Quarterly* since 1941. Through both his understanding of Pauline ethics and his description of the first-century thought-world, he has made momentous contributions to an appreciation of the apostle Paul.

The Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul, from *The Ethics of Paul* 302

FILSON, FLOYD V.: Born Hamilton, Mo., 1896. Educated Park Col. (A.B. 1918), Presby. Theol. Sem. (B.D. 1922), Univ. of Basel, Switzerland (Th.D. 1930). Ordained Presby. ministry 1922. Instr. New Testament Greek, Presby. Theol. Sem., 1923-30, prof. New Testament literature and history since 1930. He is author of *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense* (1931), *Origins of the Gospels* (1938), *Pioneers of the Christian Church* (1940), *One Lord, One Faith* (1943); co-translator of Rudolf Otto's *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (1938); coauthor with G. E. Wright, *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible* (1945). This last work, with its graphic illustrations through maps and photographs along with textual explanations, will be of great benefit to students in tracing the Pauline journeys.

Paul and the Doctrine of Recompense, from *St. Paul's Conception of Recompense* . 293

FINEGAN, JACK: Born Des Moines, Ia., 1908. Educated Drake Univ. (B.A. 1928, M.A. 1929, B.D. 1930), Colgate-Rochester Divinity Sch. (B.D. 1931, Th.M. 1932), Univ. of Berlin (Lic. Theol. *magna cum laude*, 1934). Pastor Christian Church in Iowa and New York, 1925-39; asst. prof. Old Testament, College of the Bible, Drake Univ. 1936-37; visiting lecturer in religious education, Iowa State Col. 1936-38, prof. and head of dept. 1939-46; prof. Old Testament, Pacific School of Religion since 1946; member National Hymn Book Commission, Disciples of Christ. Writings include *Die Überlieferung der Leidens und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu* (1934), *A Highway Shall Be There* (1940), *Light from the Ancient Past* (1946). This last writing has proven itself one of the most interesting and illuminating general studies in the field of biblical archeology—in both its text and its illustrations it is an invaluable volume.

The Martyrdom of Paul and Peter, from *Light from the Ancient Past* 170

FOAKES-JACKSON, FREDERICK JOHN: Born Ipswich, England, 1855; died 1941. Educated Trinity Col., Cambridge Univ. (B.A. 1879, M.A. 1882, B.D. 1903, D.D. 1905,

fellow 1886-1941). Ordained in Church of England, 1879-80; examining chaplain to bishop of Peterborough, 1897-1912; honorary canon, Peterborough, 1901-27; Hulsean lecturer, 1902; lecturer, Jesus Col., Cambridge Univ., 1882-1916; dean, 1895-1916; Lowell lecturer, Boston, Mass., 1916; lecturer, Jewish Inst. of Religion, New York City, 1924-27; General Theol. Sem., 1925-26; Briggs prof. of Christian institutions, Union Theol. Sem., 1916-34. His numerous writings include *History of the Christian Church* (to A.D. 337, 1891; 7th ed. to A.D. 461, 1923), *Christian Difficulties in the Second and Twentieth Centuries*, *A Biblical History of the Hebrews* (1903, 5th ed., 1924), *Introduction to Church History, 590-1314* (1921), *Studies on the Life of the Early Church* (1924), *Paul the Man and the Apostle* (1926), *Gentile Christianity* (1927), *Peter, Prince of Apostles* (1927), *Josephus and the Jews* (1930), *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Vols. I-III, with Kirsopp Lake, 1920-26). He was an English scholar, resident as a teacher in the United States for many years, whose own insights into the early church, as well as those he shared with Kirsopp Lake, did much to make the first century come alive for twentieth-century students.

The Gentile World, from *The Life of St. Paul* 17

GLOVER, TERROT REAVELEY: Born Bristol, England, 1869; died 1943. Educated St. John's Col., Cambridge Univ. (fellow 1892-98, 1901), honorary doctorates from Queen's Univ., McMaster Univ., St. Andrews Univ., Glasgow Univ., Trinity Col., Dublin. Prof. of Latin, Queen's Univ., Canada, 1896-1901; classical lecturer, St. John's Col., Cambridge Univ., 1901-39; public orator, Cambridge, 1920-39; Wilde lecturer in natural and comparative religion, Oxford Univ., 1917-21; Lowell lecturer, Boston, Mass., 1922; Sather prof. classics, Univ. of California, 1923; pres. Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, 1924; Donnellan lecturer, Trinity Col., Dublin, 1932. Among his many writings the following pertain to New Testament studies: *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire* (1909), *The Jesus of History* (1917), *Paul of Tarsus* (1925), *The Influences of Christ in the Ancient World* (1929), *The World of the New Testament* (1931), *The Disciple* (1941). Baptist leader in the British Isles, eminent ancient historian, he is particularly known to Bible students through his graphic and scholarly writings on the culture of the first century and for his clear interpretations of both Jesus and Paul.

Tarsus, from *Paul of Tarsus* 82

GOGUEL, MAURICE: Born Paris, France, 1880. Educated lycee Condorcet; faculté des lettres, faculté de théologie, école des hautes études (Sorbonne, Docteur en Théologie, Docteur ès Lettres). Professor at the faculté libre de théologie protestante (Paris), and directeur d'études at the école des hautes études (Sorbonne). Of his numerous books the following have been translated into the English: *Jesus the Nazarene—Myth or History* (1926) and *The Life of Jesus* (1933). His studies on the person of Jesus are considered some of the most important of contemporary New Testament interpreters, and he with the late Charles Guignebert are looked upon as the most stimulating of present-day French New Testament scholars.

The Pauline Evidence, from *The Life of Jesus* 207

GOODSPEED, EDGAR J.: Born Quincy, Ill., 1871. Educated Denison Univ. (A.B. 1890); Yale Univ., Univ. of Chicago (B.D. 1897, Ph.D. 1898), Univ. of Berlin. Instr. biblical and patristic Greek, Univ. of Chicago, 1902-5, assistant prof., 1905-10, asso. prof., 1910-15, prof. 1915-37, secretary to the president, 1920-24, chairman New Testament dept., 1923-37, distinguished service prof., 1933-37, prof. emeritus since 1937; lecturer in history, Univ. of Calif. 1938-41; lecturer in biblical literature, Scripps Col., 1941. He is author of *The Story of the New Testament* (1916),

Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels (with E. D. Burton, 1917), *The New Testament—An American Translation* (1923), *The Making of the English New Testament* (1925), *The Formation of the New Testament* (1926), *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (1927), *Strange New Gospels* (1931), *The Meaning of Ephesians* (1933), *The Story of the Old Testament* (1936), *An Introduction to the New Testament* (1937), *New Chapters in New Testament Study* (1937), *The Apocrypha—An American Translation* (1938), *Christianity Goes to Press* (1940), *Four Pillars of Democracy* (1940), *How Came the Bible?* (1940), *History of Early Christian Literature* (1941), *Problems of New Testament Translation* (1945), *How to Read the Bible* (1946), *Paul* (1947). One of most prolific writers in the New Testament field, and especially noted for his New Testament translation, he is an articulate scholar whose clear literary style has made extremely readable a very broad field of New Testament studies. In his preface to *Paul*, Dr. Goodspeed writes, "Paul was a great man . . .; what he said to them [his first century listeners] can still guide and instruct us, even in this late day, and teach our generation lessons of faith, tolerance, love, and courage it still greatly needs to learn."

The First Collection of Paul's Letters, from *An Introduction to the New Testament* 201

GUIGNEBERT, CHARLES: Born Villeneuve-Saint-Georges, France, 1867; died 1939. Teacher history at Eureux, Pau, Toulouse, and Voltaire (de los Liceos); from 1906-39 prof. of Christianity, Univ. of Paris. A number of liberal constructive New Testament writings have come from his research, three of them translated into the English language: *Christianity, Past and Present* (1927), *Jesus* (1935), *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus* (1939). Among books on the Jewish milieu from which Christianity emerged, Guignebert's latest writing ranks near the top.

The Law, The Scribes, The Synagogue. From *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus* 64

HATCH, WILLIAM H. P.: Born Camden, N. J., 1875. Educated Harvard Univ. (A.B. 1898, A.M. 1899, Ph.D. 1904, S.T.B. 1906), Episcopal Theol. Sch., Cambridge, Mass. (B.D. 1902), Union Theol. Sem. (D.D. (1915), Strasbourg Univ. (D. Theol. 1925). Ordained minister in Protestant Episcopal Church 1902, minister of churches in New York and Massachusetts 1902-8; instr. in literature and interpretation of New Testament, General Theol. Sem. 1908-9, adj. prof. 1909-13, prof. 1913-17; prof. literature and interpretation of New Testament, Episcopal Theol. Sch. 1917-46; vicar Christ Church, Boston, Mass., 1941-46; annual prof. American Sch. of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, 1922-23, lecturer 1928-29. Writings include *The Pauline Idea of Faith* (1917), *The Idea of Faith in Christian Literature from the Death of Saint Paul to the Close of the Second Century* (1925), *Greek and Syrian Miniatures in Jerusalem* (1931), *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament at Mount Sinai* (1932), *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament in Jerusalem* (1934), *The "Western" Texts of the Gospels* (1937), *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament* (1939), *An Album of Dated Syrian Manuscripts* (1946). Although his research and writings have dealt mainly with manuscripts, his two earlier writings dealt with Christian faith during the first two centuries; in these two books stimulating and accurate interpretations are made of that Christian essential. No clearer exposition has been made of Pauline faith.

The Pauline Idea of Faith, from *The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion* 342

HOLMES, ARTHUR: Born Cincinnati, Ohio, 1872. Educated Bethany Col. W. Va. 1894-95), Hiram Col. (B.A. 1899), Univ. of Pennsylvania (A.M. 1903, Ph.D. 1908, Th.B., Th.M. 1930, Th.D. 1932). Ordained ministry Disciples of Christ

1899. Minister of churches and Y.M.C.A. director 1899-1908; instr. psychology Univ. of Pennsylvania 1908-9, asst. prof. 1909-12, asst. director psycho-clinic 1908-12; dean general faculty, Pennsylvania State Col. 1912-18, pres. Drake Univ. 1918-22; prof. psychology, Univ. of Pennsylvania 1922-34; prof. and head dept. of philosophy and psychology of religion, Butler Univ. since 1933. Author of *Decay of Rationalism* (1909), *The Conservation of the Child* (1912), *Principles of Character Making* (1913), *Backward Children* (1915), *Controlled Power* (1924), *The Mind of St. Paul* (1929). His latest writing gives one of the most interesting studies of Paul as seen from the angle of modern psychology.

The Man Made Whole, from *The Mind of St. Paul* 147

KENNEDY, HENRY A. A.: Born Dornoch, Sutherlandshire, Scotland, 1866; died 1834. Educated Edinburgh Univ. (M.A., D.Sc., D.D.), Halle Univ., Berlin Univ., Queen's Univ., Canada. Minister of Callander United Free Church, 1893-1905; Cunningham lecturer, United Free Church of Scotland, 1902-4; prof. Knox Col., Toronto, Canada, 1905-9; prof. New Testament languages, literature, and theology, New College, Edinburgh, 1909 until retirement. Writings include *Sources of New Testament Greek* (1895), *Commentary on Philippians* (Expositor's Greek Testament, 1903), *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things* (1904), *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions* (1913), *The Theology of the Epistles* (1919), *Philo's Contribution to Religion* (1919), *Vital Forces of the Early Church* (1920). With his accurate scholarship focusing mainly on Paul, he has made inestimable contributions in clarifying both the theology of Paul and the first century religious milieu in which Paul "modernised the gospel."

Relation of Paul to the Mystery-Religions, from *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions* 49

KLAUSNER, JOSEPH: Born in Russia, 1874. Educated in Russia; Univ. of Heidelberg (Ph.D.) His life has been devoted to Zionism through his lectures and writings, a movement in which he was early influenced by "Ahad ha-Am" (Asher Ginsberg). Though most of his writings have been in Hebrew, Klausner is known to non-Jews in *Die messianischen Vorstellungen* (1904), *Jesus of Nazareth* (1925), and *From Jesus to Paul* (1943). Thirty-two years of collected notes for this last volume were stolen from his ransacked Jerusalem home in 1929; and the book was finished during three and one-half years of riots. In this writing he "clarifies the nature of Judaism and Christianity in general, and shows what is common to both of them and what divides them and distinguishes them from each other."

What Is Paul for the Jews? from *From Jesus to Paul* 368

KNOX, JOHN: Born Frankfort, Ky., 1900. Educated Randolph-Macon Col. (A.B. 1919), Emory Univ. (B.D. 1925), Univ. of Chicago (Ph.D. 1935). Asst. prof. of biblical literature, Emory Univ., 1924-27; prof. religion, Fisk Univ., 1929-36; managing editor *Christendom*, 1936-38; assoc. prof. New Testament, Hartford Theol. Sem., 1938-39; prof. of preaching, Univ. of Chicago, 1939-40; Baldwin prof. of sacred literature and director of studies, Union Theol. Sem., since 1940. Writings include *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul* (1935), *The Man Christ Jesus* (1941), *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (1950), *Marcion and the New Testament* (1942), *Christ the Lord* (1945). These last two books have been deeply helpful in clarifying the christological problem of the New Testament, in an idiom of meaning for twentieth-century followers of Jesus.

[The Pauline Chronology], from *Chapters in a Life of Paul* 161

KNOX, WILFRED LAWRENCE: Born Leicester, England, 1886. Educated Trinity Col., Oxford (M.A., D.D.). Warden Trinity Col. Mission Settlement, Stratford; Junior Examiner in Board of Education; asst. priest, St. Mary's and St. Saviour's;

priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd since 1920; honorary canon of Ely since 1933; at present chaplain Pembroke Col., Cambridge Univ. Writings include *The Catholic Movement in the Church of England* (1930), *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* (1925), *Meditation and Mental Prayer* (1927), *The Church in Crisis* (1930), *Life of St. Paul* (1932), *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (1939), *The Gospel of God and the Authority of the Church* (1937), *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (1944). He is a careful interpreter whose major writings have centered on the relation of Paul to both the Jewish and the Gentile environments of the first century.

"And the Rock Was Christ," from *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* . . . 90

LAKE, KIRKOPF C.: Born Southhampton, England, 1872; died 1946. Educated Lincoln College, Oxford (B.A. 1895, M.A. 1897), honorary degrees from St. Andrews Univ., Leyden Univ., Heidelberg Univ. (Germany), Univ. of Michigan. Curate of Lunley, Durham, England, 1895, of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, 1897-1904, prof. of theology, Univ. of Leyden, Holland, 1904-14; prof. of early Christian literature, Harvard Univ., 1914-19, Winn prof. ecclesiastical history, 1919-32, prof. of history, 1932-38; honorary fellow Lincoln Col., Oxford, 1941; fellow American Academy of Arts and Sciences, awarded medal by British Academy, director of archaeological expeditions to Serabit (1930-35), to Samaria (1929-34), to Lake Van (1938-39). Besides numerous translations and textual studies his writings include *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (1907), *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (1911), *The Stewardship of Faith* (1915), *Landmarks in Early Christian History* (1920), *Immortality and the Modern Mind* (1922), *Religion Yesterday and To-morrow* (1925), *Paul: His Heritage and Legacy* (1934), *An Introduction to the New Testament* (1937), *The Beginnings of Christianity* (Vol. I, 1920, Vol. II, 1922, Vol. III, 1926, Vols. IV and V, 1932). This last mentioned series on the comprehensive appreciation of early Christianity will remain the classic writing for appreciating the background and the historical literature related to the Pauline period.

The Authenticity of 2 Thessalonians, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* 234

LIETZMANN, HANS: Born Düsseldorf, Germany, 1875; died 1942. Educated universities of Jena and Bonn (D. Theol.). Teacher church history at Jena, 1905-8; Bonn, 1900-1905, 1908-24; Berlin, where he succeeded Adolf Harnack, 1924-42. A prolific writer and accurate scholar, he issued *Kleine Texte* (1900), critical editions of ordinarily inaccessible source material. In 1905 he brought forth the first of his five volumes of *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*. His two books best known in the English are *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* (1937) and *The Founding of the Church Universal* (1938). As a scholar who combines scholarly acumen with sweeping devotional style, he has few peers, his writings on the early church draw with real artistry the apostle Paul and his contemporaries as they dramatically move about in the first century.

[Who Was This Paul?], from *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* 99

MCCOWN, CHESTER CHARLTON: Born Orion, Ill., 1877. Educated DePauw Univ. (A.B. 1898), Garrett Biblical Inst. (B.D. 1902), universities of Heidelberg and Berlin, Univ. of Chicago (Ph.D. 1914). Ordained Meth. ministry 1898. Pastor in Illinois 1898-99, 1900-1902, 1908-9; prof. mathematics, Upper Iowa Univ., 1899-1900; principal, American Methodist Institution, Calcutta, India, 1902-6; prof. biblical literature, Wesley Col., Grand Forks, N. D., 1909-12, Y.M.C.A. Col. Chicago, 1912-14; prof. New Testament literature and interpretation, Pacific School of Religion, 1914-47, dean, 1928-36; director, Palestinian Archaeological Institute, since 1936; Thayer fellow, American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, 1920-21, director, 1929-31, prof. and acting director 1935-36; joint director, Yale

Univ.-American School Expedition, Jerash, 1930-31. He is author of *The Promise of His Coming* (1921), *The Testament of Solomon* (1922), *Genesis of the Social Gospel* (1929), *The Search for the Real Jesus* (1940); editor of *Journal of Palestine Oriental Society* (1930); author of *The Ladder of Progress in Palestine* (1943). As a New Testament scholar whose interests have comprehended archaeology, theology, textual problems, and first-century cultures, his accurate studies have done much to help New Testament students appreciate more deeply "the real Jesus" and "the real Paul."

The Sources of Pauline Mysticism, from *Munera Studiosa* 114

MACGREGOR, GEORGE H. C.: Born Aberdeen, Scotland, 1892. Educated Eastbourne Col., Cambridge Univ. (A.B. 1912, A.M. 1922, B.D. 1929). Pastor in Scotland, 1918-28; Bruce Lecturer, Glasgow, 1928; Hosmer prof. New Testament exegesis, Hartford Theol. Sem., U.S.A., 1929-32; since 1933 prof. divinity and biblical criticism, Univ. of Glasgow. His writings include *The Gospel of John* (1928), *Eucharistic Origins* (1929), *Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ* (with A. C. Purdy, 1936), *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism* (1937), *The Relevance of the Impossible* (1941). A teacher whose stimulus has affected the students of both Scotland and the United States, he is best known through his interpreting the relationship of Jesus and his interpreters to the Hellenistic culture of the first century.

The Preparation in Philosophy, from *Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ* 24

MACHEN, J. GRESHAM: Born Baltimore, Md., 1881; died 1937. Educated Johns Hopkins Univ. (A.B. 1901), Princeton Univ. (M.A. 1904, B.D. 1905) Marburg Univ., Göttingen Univ. (1905-6). Ordained Presbyterian ministry 1914; Y.M.C.A. war work in France, 1918-19. Inst. in New Testament, Princeton Theol. Sem., 1906-14, asst. prof. New Testament literature and exegesis, 1914-29; prof. of New Testament, Westminster Theol. Sem., 1929-37. Writings include *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1921), *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923), *New Testament Greek for Beginners* (1923), *What Is Faith?* (1925), *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1930). As an erudite and encyclopedic scholar, he has been one of America's strongest proponents for conservative theological viewpoints in the Christian tradition.

Paul and Jesus, from *The Origin of Paul's Religion* 374

MOFFATT, JAMES: Born Glasgow, Scotland, 1870; died 1946. Educated Glasgow Univ., St. Andrews Univ., Oxford Univ. Minister, United Free Church of Scotland, 1896-1912; Yates prof. Greek, Mansfield Col., Oxford, 1911-15; prof. church history, United Free Church Col., Glasgow, 1915-27; Washburn prof. church history, Union Theol. Sem., 1927-38. He is author of *Hebrews* (1924) in "The International Critical Commentary" and *The General Epistles* (1928) and *First Corinthians* (1938) in "The Moffatt Commentary" and a number of other books, including *The First Five Centuries of the Church* (1938), *The Books of the Prophets* (1939), and *Jesus Christ the Same* (1940). Probably no contemporary New Testament scholar is more widely known than he, mainly through his translation of the Bible and his editorship of the New Testament commentaries based on it. His *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (1911) has been the classic introduction for more than thirty years. The insights into critical problems related to the Pauline letters are depicted with comprehension in it.

Pauline Chronology, from *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* . . . 157

MOORE, GEORGE FOOT: Born West Chester, Pa., 1851; died 1931. Educated Yale Univ. (A.B. 1872, A.M. 1883), graduate Union Theol. Sem. 1877; honorary doctorates from Marietta Col., Yale, Göttingen, Western Reserve, Harvard, Hebrew Union Col. Ordained Presbyterian ministry 1878, pastor of churches, 1878-83. Prof. Hebrew, Andover Theol. Sem. 1883-1902; prof. theol. 1902-4,

Harvard Univ., Frothingham prof. history of religion 1904-31. Writings include *Commentary on Judges* (International Critical Commentary, 1895), *The Book of Judges* (Translation and Notes: Polychrome Bible, 1898), *The Book of Judges in Hebrew* (1900), *The Literature of the Old Testament* (1913), *History of Religions* (Vol. I, 1913, rev. ed., 1920; Vol. II, 1919), *Metempsychosis* (1914), *Judaism* (2 vols., 1927). His writings, which show the Jewish setting out of which Christianity emerged, and his studies in comparative religions, which show Christianity as related to other religious ideologies, are classic volumes.

Character of Judaism, from *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Vol. I 56

MORGAN, WILLIAM: Born Aberdeenshire, Scotland, 1862; died 1928. Educated Aberdeen Univ. (M.A., D.D.), United Presbyterian Col., Edinburgh; Halle Univ. For eighteen years he was minister of the United Free Church, Tarbolton, Ayrshire; acted as examiner in philosophy, Aberdeen Univ., prof. systematic theology and apologetics, Queen's Theol. Col., Kingston, Canada, 1912; delivered Kerr lectures in Glasgow, 1914; Dudgeon lecture, Harvard Univ., 1921. Writings include *The Religion and Theology of Paul* (1917), *The Nature and Right of Religion* (1926). The former of these two writings, the Kerr lectures, is considered as one of the best correlations and interpretations of the thought system of the apostle Paul.

Paul and Jesus, from *The Religion and Theology of Paul* 381

NOCK, ARTHUR DARBY: Born Portsmouth, England, 1902. Educated Trinity Col., Cambridge Univ. (B.A. 1922, M.A. 1926), Birmingham Univ. (LL.D. 1934). Fellow of Clare Col. (Cambridge Univ.) 1923-30, lecturer in classics 1926-30; visiting lecturer Harvard Univ. 1929, Frothingham prof. history of religion, since 1930; Donnellan lecturer, Trinity Col. Dublin, 1931; Lowell lecturer, King's Chapel, Boston, 1933; Swander lecturer, General Seminary of Reformed Churches, Lancaster, Pa., 1938; Gifford lecturer, Aberdeen Univ., 1939-40; Haskell lecturer, Oberlin, 1941-42. Writings include *Sallustius Concerning the Gods and the Universe* (1926), *Conversion* (1933), *St. Paul* (1938); co-author and translator of other works; contributor to encyclopedias. Through his breadth of understanding related to various religious cultures, he has made unique contributions to Pauline studies.

The Style and Thought of Paul, from *St. Paul* 182

NYGREN, ANDERS: Born Göteborg, Sweden, 1890. Graduate Univ. of Lund, 1912, in theol. Pastor Olmevalla (Lutheran Church), 1912-20; instr. 1920-24, prof. since 1924 in philosophy of religion, Univ. of Lund. Among his many books in Swedish, one translated into the English, *Agape and Eros* (1938, 2 vols.), has had wide circulation. In 1934 he published his antagonism to Nazism in "The Church Controversy in Germany." Active in ecumenical movements, he was a delegate to Lausanne in 1927, to Edinburgh and Oxford in 1937. In 1947 he was elected president of the Lutheran World Federation. His unique contribution to Christian thought is in defining divine love, *agape*, as a fact, an action, rather than an idea. "It is the action which God effected in Christ when Christ gave himself for us." *Agape* as a self-giving love which creates value in its object is differentiated from *eros* which is self-centered.

The Agape of the Cross, from *Agape and Eros* 333

OTTO, RUDOLPH: Born Peine, Germany, 1869; died 1938. Educated universities of Erlangen and Göttingen (D. Theol., D. Phil.). Teacher systematic theology Göttingen 1897-1911, Breslau 1915-17; teacher philosophy of religion, Marburg 1917-29. His books translated into English are *The Idea of the Holy* (1929), *India's Religion of Grace and Christianity Compared* (1930), *Philosophy of Re-*

ligion (1931), *Mysticism—East and West* (1932), *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (1938). His stress upon the particular *numinous* as an aspect of the religious feeling has been basic in his interpretation of mysticism. In New Testament studies both his interpretation of the eschatological problem and his attitude toward the origins behind the Jewish-Christian tradition have aroused wide interest. Paul as a "charismatic type" is a good aperture into Otto's unusual mode of interpretation.

The Charismatic Type, from *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* 128

PORTER, FRANK CHAMBERLAIN: Born Beloit, Wisconsin, 1859; died 1946. Educated Beloit Col. (A.B. 1880, A.M., 1883), Chicago Theol. Sem., Hartford Theol. Sem., Yale Univ. (B.D. 1886, Ph.D. 1889). Instr. biblical theology, Yale, 1889-91, Winkley prof. 1891-1927; lecturer Peking Univ. China, 1924-25. Writings include *The Yecor Hara, in Biblical and Semitic Studies* (1901), *Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers* (1905), *The Mind of Christ in Paul* (1929). This last book gives an excellent viewpoint of Paul's Christocentric appreciation of religious experience.

Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul 283

PRAT, FERNAND: Born à La Fétarie, Aveyron, France, 1857; died 1937. A priest in the Society of Jesuits; educated at various Jesuit schools, received his diploma from Montpellier, 1880; *licence ès lettres*, Toulouse, 1882. Among the places he taught English, biblical and allied Oriental languages, sacred scriptures are Grenoble, Beyrouth, Collège de Saint-Affrique, Nouvelle-Castille, Château-l'Évêque, Ditton-Hall near Liverpool, Toulouse, Enghien. His novitiate began September 8, 1873, under Père Pre de Blacas, Rector of Juvénat et Supérieur de la Résidence dle la Rue des Fleurs, and was completed in 1875. During World War I he was decorated with the Croix de la Légion d'honneur. He is the author of eight books in French, numerous religious articles in Roman Catholic dictionaries. Of his several articles translated into English, Italian, and German the only one—and his major work—translated into the English is *The Theology of Saint Paul* (2 vols., 1946). Not only are these two volumes the outstanding Roman Catholic appreciation of the apostle Paul; they vie with all contemporary evaluations of Paul as among the finest and most scholarly.

Paul and the Old Testament, from *The Theology of Saint Paul* 197

PURDY, ALEXANDER C.: Born West Laurens, N. Y., 1890. Educated Penn Col. (A.B. 1910), Hartford Theol. Sem. (B.D. 1913, Ph.D. 1916), Marburg Univ., Harvard Univ. Prof. biblical lit., and church history, Earlham Col. 1916-23; Hosmer prof. New Testament, Hartford Theol. Sem. since 1923, acting president 1944-45; acting chaplain, Stanford Univ., spring 1939; acting director, Pendle Hill, 1940. Author of *The Way of Christ* (1918), *Pathways to God* (1922), *Jesus' Way with People* (1926), *Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ* (with G. H. C. Macgregor, 1936), *Jesus as His Followers Knew Him* (1944), *The Gospels and Epistles of John* (1946). Few books excel the one on the religious atmosphere of the first century which he and Macgregor wrote, and which vividly portrays the contributions of philosophy, mystery religions, and Jewish ideas to that culture.

The Preparation in Philosophy, from *Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ* 24

RALL, HARRIS FRANKLIN: Born Council Bluffs, Iowa, 1870. Educated Univ. of Iowa (A.B. 1891, A.M. 1892), Yale Divinity School (B.D. 1897), Univ. of Berlin, Univ. of Halle-Wittenberg (Ph.D.). Ordained Meth. ministry 1900. Pastor, Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn., 1900-1904; First Church, Baltimore, 1904-10; president, Iliff School of Theology, Denver, 1910-15; prof. Christian doctrine, Garrett Biblical Inst., 1915-1945. His books include *The Meaning of God* (1925), *Christianity and Judaism Compare Notes* (1927), *Christianity Today* (1928), *A Faith*

for *Today* (1936), *Religion and Public Affairs* (1937), *Christianity* (1940), *According to Paul* (1944), *The Christian Faith and the Way* (1947); editor of *A Guide for Bible Readers* (8 vols., 1945-47). For thirty years Rall's writings on biblical and religious-philosophical themes have by their clearness and constructive liberal viewpoint aided students to understand the process of "modernizing the gospel" of Jesus and about Jesus.

How Paul Thought of Christ, from *According to Paul* 280

RAMSAY, WILLIAM MITCHELL: Born Glasgow, Scotland, 1851; died 1939. Educated Univ. of Aberdeen, Oxford Univ., Göttingen Univ., recipient of honorary doctorates in England, Scotland, France, Germany, United States. Prof. of humanity, Aberdeen Univ. 1886-1911; visiting lecturer at Oxford Univ., Johns Hopkins Univ., Cambridge Univ.; one of original members of the British academy; traveled widely in Asiatic Turkey 1880-1914, 1920, 1924-28. His twenty-five volumes include *The Church in the Roman Empire* (1893), *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Vol. I, 1895; Vol. II, 1897), *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (1895), *Pauline and Other Studies in Early Christian History* (1906), *The Cities of St. Paul* (1907), *Luke and Other Studies in the History of Religion* (1908), *The First Christian Century* (1911), *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day* (1913). By his travels over the territory once journeyed by Paul, and through his careful studies of the cities once missionarized by that apostle, he has made the first-century Mediterranean world come alive for twentieth-century readers.

Did Paul See Jesus? From *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day* . . . 122

RIDDLE, DONALD WAYNE: Born Kirkland, Ill., 1894. Educated Univ. of Chicago (Ph.B. 1920, Ph.D. 1923), Northwestern Univ. (A.M. 1921), Garrett Biblical Inst. (B.D. 1921). Prof. biblical languages, Kimball Sch. Theol., Oregon, 1922-26; inst. New Testament literature, Univ. of Chicago, 1923, asst. prof. 1927-29, assoc. prof. 1929-42; lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army Air Corps, 1942-45; since 1946, prof. American history and chairman social science division, Univ. of Illinois at Chicago. His writings include *Jesus and the Pharisee* (1928), *The Martyrs, a Study in Social Control* (1931), *Early Christian Life as Reflected in Its Literature* (1936), *The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth* (1939), *Paul, Man of Conflict* (1940). Both through his description of the literature which came out of the first-century Christian world as well as through his stimulating view of Paul, he has made unique contributions to "contemporary thinking about Paul."

Survivals, from *Paul, Man of Conflict* 393

SCHWEITZER, ALBERT: Born Kaysersberg, Alsace, 1875. Educated universities of Strasbourg, Paris, and Berlin. Curate, St. Nicholas, Strasbourg, 1899; privatdozent, Univ. of Strasbourg, 1901-12; organist, Société J. S. Bach of Paris, 1903-11; organist, Orfeo Catala of Barcelona; missionary surgeon and founder of hospital at Lambaréné, Gabon, Equatorial Africa, 1913-17, 1924-27, 1929-32; Hibbert lecturer, Oxford and London, 1934; Gifford lecturer, Edinburgh, 1934-35. Among his many writings the following are some which have been translated into the English language: *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1911), *Paul and His Interpreters* (1912), *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest* (1922), *Philosophy of Civilization* (2 vols., 1923), *Memoirs of Childhood and Youth*, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (1931), *More from the Primeval Forest* (1931), *The Forest Hospital at Lambaréné* (1931), *My Life and Thought* (1933), *Indian Thought and Its Development* (1936), *From My African Notebook* (1939). Student of Bach, skillful organist, and medical missionary in the Lambaréné Forest, Albert Schweitzer stands high in New Testament circles for his scholarship. In his

Pauline studies his viewing of Paul's mysticism as related to the eschatological atmosphere of the first century has aroused wide attention.

The Pauline Epistles, from *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* 239

SCOTT, CHARLES ANDERSON: Born Manchester, England, 1859; died 1941. Educated St. John's Col., Cambridge Univ. (M.A. 1896, D.D. 1920), New College, Edinburgh, Univ. of Leipzig, Univ. of Jena. Moderator Presbyterian Church of England, 1923; Hulsean lectures, 1928-30; minister Presbyterian churches, 1887-1907; Dunn prof. New Testament, Theol. Col. of Presbyterian Church of England, 1907-32; examiner in historical theology, Univ. of London, 1902-7; tripos examiner at Cambridge Univ. His writings include *Revelation* (Century Bible, 1902), *The Book of Revelation* (1905), *The Fellowship of the Spirit* (1921), *Christianity According to St. Paul* (1927), *New Testament Ethics* (1930), *Living Issues in the New Testament* (1933), *Footnotes to St. Paul* (1935), *St. Paul, the Man and the Teacher* (1936), *Romanism and the Gospel* (1937). He is one of England's Presbyterian leaders whose writings in recent years concentrated on an interpretation of the apostle Paul. His writings have been of wide help because of their lucidity and sane interpretive position.

The Death of Christ as a Sacrifice, from *Christianity According to St. Paul* 326

SCOTT, ERNEST F.: Born Durham, England, 1868. Educated Glasgow Univ. (A.M. 1888), Balliol Col., Oxford (A.B. 1892), United Presbyterian Theol. Hall, Edinburgh. Pastor, Prestwick United Free Church, Scotland, 1895-1908; prof. New Testament literature, Queen's Univ., Kingston, Can., 1908-19, Union Theol. Sem. 1919-38. Among his writings are *The Fourth Gospel* (1906), *The Historical and Religious Value of the Fourth Gospel* (1911), *The Kingdom and the Messiah* (1912), *The Beginnings of the Church* (1914), *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1923), *The Spirit in the New Testament* (1923), *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus* (1924), *The First Age of Christianity* (1926), *The Gospel and Its Tributaries* (1929), *Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians* (1930) in "The Moffatt Commentary," *The Kingdom of God* (1931), *The Literature of the New Testament* (1933), *The Nature of the Early Church* (1941), *Man and Society in the New Testament* (1946), *The Varieties of New Testament Religion* (1946), *Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (1947). Regarding the writing of Paul to the Roman church, Scott expresses his evaluation of the perennial value of Paul: "The Epistle to the Romans, for all its wrappings, is essentially a modern book, and only when we so read it can we apprehend its true message."

[Difficulties in Paul's Religion], from *The Varieties of New Testament Religion* . . 355

STREETER, BURNETT H.: Born Croydon, England, 1874; died 1939. Educated King's Col. School, London; Queen's Col., Oxford (A.M.). Canon of Hereford, 1915-34; fellow and dean, Pembroke Col., Oxford, 1899-1905; fellow and praelector, Queen's Col., Oxford, 1905-33; Ireland prof. exegesis, Oxford Univ., 1932-33; provost, Queen's Col., Oxford, after 1934. He contributed to *Oxford Studies in Synoptic Problems* (1911) and was author of a number of books, including *Immortality* (1917), *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (1924), *Reality: A New Correlation of Science and Religion* (1926), *The Primitive Church* (1929), *The Chained Library* (1931), *The Buddha and the Christ* (1932), *The God Who Speaks* (1936). While Streeter is best known through his work on the four-document hypothesis as related to the Synoptic Gospels, his writing which deals with the early church centers, their problems, and the evolution of the church order is equally as alluring to read and as suggestive in interpretation for Pauline insights.

[The Pauline Corpus], from *The Primitive Church* 226

TASKER, RANDOLPH VINCENT GREENWOOD: Born England, 1895. Educated Corpus Christi Col., Westcott House, Cambridge Univ. (M.A., B.D.). Curate of Christ Church, Purley, 1922-24; domestic chaplain to Bishop of Oxford, 1924-25; lecturer, King's Col., London, 1926; rector Chenies, Bucks, 1928-34; head of dept. of New Testament, King's Col., London, 1934, prof. of exegesis since 1936; chaplain Lincoln's Inn, 1936-39; rector of Lambourne with Abridge, 1942-46. Writings include *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels* (1944), *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (1945); editor, *Augustine: City of God* (Everyman's Library, 1945). His chief contribution is his book which shows how each of the New Testament writers has used and catalogued references from the books of the Old Testament.

[Paul's Use of the Old Testament], from *The Old Testament in the New Testament* 187

TAYLOR, VINCENT: Born England, 1887. Educated Divinity School, Univ. of London (B.D. 1911, Ph.D. 1926), Richmond Col., Surrey. Entered Meth. ministry 1909. Pastor at Mansfield, Carmarthen, Bath, Kleighley, Aberdeen; examiner biblical languages, London Univ., 1931-34; examiner New Testament Greek, Univ. of Wales, 1937-42; principal Wesley Col., Headingly, Leeds, Ferens prof. New Testament language and literature, since 1930. His writings include *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth* (1920), *Behind the Third Gospel* (1926), *The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel* (1927), *The Gospels: A Short Introduction* (1930), *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (1933), *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (1937), *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching* (1940), *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (1941). Among British New Testament students he holds a high position in his labors as related to the virgin birth of Jesus, the Fourth Gospel, form criticism, and his insights into Pauline theology.

The Sayings in the Pauline Narrative of the Last Supper, from *Jesus and His Sacrifice* 318

WEINEL, HEINRICH: Born Vonhausen (Hessen), Germany, 1874. Educated at Berlin Univ., Friedberg Univ., Giessen Univ. (D.Ph., D.Th.). Teacher in earlier years in theological studies at Giessen Univ., Berlin Univ., Bonn Univ., and Marburg Univ.; for many years prof. systematic theol., Univ. of Jena. His writings translated into the English are *St. Paul, the Man and His Work* (1906), *Jesus in the Nineteenth Century and After* (with Alban Widgery, 1914). His interpretation of the Apostle is still considered one of the most beautifully written and deeply interpretive works; and his historical study of interpretations of Jesus will remain a classic volume.

[Paul—Stranger and Saint], from *St. Paul* 362

WEISS, JOHANNES: Born Kiel, Germany, 1863; died 1914. Educated at universities in Marburg, Berlin, Gottingen, and Breslau. After being a privadozent and professor at Gottingen Univ. and a professor in Marburg Univ., he was at Heidelberg Univ., 1908-14, as prof. New Testament exegesis and criticism. Among his numerous writings three have been translated into the English: *Christ. The Beginnings of Dogma* (1909), *Paul and Jesus* (1909), *The History of Primitive Christianity* (2 vols., 1937). He is one of the founders of the "eschatological school," in which Jesus saw himself as the predestined Messiah, and the one through whom God would dramatically realize his kingdom in his own generation. "Christianity was for [Weiss] no mere system of ideas, however impressive or sublime; it was from the outset a living, personal faith—in short, a religion." Also he was active with a number of other German scholars in discussing the "Jesus or Paul" controversy.

The Theological Thinker, from *The History of Primitive Christianity* 398

WILDER, AMOS NIVEN: Born Madison, Wis., 1895. Educated Oberlin Col., Yale Univ. (A.B. 1920, B.D. 1924, Ph.D. 1933), Mansfield Col., Oxford, Harvard

Univ. Ordained Cong. ministry 1925. Pastor, First Church of Christ, North Conway, N. H., 1925-28; asso. prof. ethics and Christian evidences, Hamilton Col., 1930-33; prof. New Testament interpretation, Andover Newton Theol. Sem. 1933-43; Chicago Theol. Sem. since 1943. His writings include *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus* (1939), *Spiritual Aspects of the New Poetry* (1940), *The Healing of the Waters* (1943). He is a New Testament scholar who has become well known and appreciated for his writing of poetry and his critical appraisal of spiritual values in poetry. Through his appreciation of New Testament ideas he views the eschatological sanction as secondary to the sanction for righteousness in Jesus' summons to the coming kingdom.

[The Modernizing of Paul's Message] 409

WILLOUGHBY, HAROLD RIDEOUT: Born North Haverhill, New Hampshire, 1890. Educated Wesleyan Univ. (A.B. 1915, A.M. 1916), Garrett Biblical Inst. (B.D. 1918), Univ. of Chicago (Ph.D. 1924), Princeton Univ., Univ. of Berlin, American Academy at Rome. Instr. Univ. of Chicago, 1924, asst. prof. 1926-29, assoc. prof. 1929-43; prof. of Christian origins, Federated Theol. Faculty since 1943; head Goodspeed Hall, 1919-36; Bennett lecturer, Garrett Biblical Inst., 1929, 1938; special lecturer in Jerusalem, 1937, American Society of Oriental Research; iconographic research for American Council Learned Societies, Leningrad, 1933; Haskell lecturer, Oberlin, 1947-48. Writings include *Pagan Regeneration* (1929), *The Rockefeller McCormick New Testament* (Vol. III), *The Miniatures* (1932), *Codex 2400 and Its Miniatures* (1933), *The Coverdale Psalter and the Quattrocentenary of the Printed English Bible* (1935), *The Four Gospels of Karahissar* (Vol. II, 1936), *The Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse* (Vol. I, 1940), *The First Authorized English Bible and the Crenmer Preface* (1942), *Soldiers' Bibles Through Three Centuries* (1944); editor and co-contributor to numerous volumes. Through careful editing of early Christian manuscripts and colorful depicting of early Christian origins, he has helped to clarify both the Christian beginnings and the atmosphere in which Paul's interpretations of Christ came into existence.

Mystery Initiation, from *Pagan Regeneration* 34

WREDE, WILLIAM: Born Bücken, Germany, 1859; died 1906. Educated at universities in Leipzig and Göttingen. Taught in field of New Testament at Göttingen Univ.; prof. New Testament exegesis in Breslau Univ. 1895-1906. His writings include *Paul* (1907) and *The Origin of the New Testament* (1909). In the "Jesus or Paul" controversy his viewpoint, which discerns Paul's thought as "mystical" yet deeply inspirational, is both interesting and stimulating.

Paul's Importance in the History of the World, from *Paul* 390

INDEX OF TITLES

<i>According to Paul: How Paul Thought of Christ</i> , by Harris F. Rall	280
<i>Agape and Eros: The Agape of the Cross</i> , by Anders Nygren	333
<i>Agape of the Cross, The</i> , from <i>Agape and Eros</i> , by Anders Nygren	333
<i>Ancient Wrong, The</i> , from <i>The Meaning of Paul for Today</i> , by C. H. Dodd	263
"And the Rock Was Christ," from <i>St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles</i> , by Wilfred L. Knox	90
<i>Authenticity of 2 Thessalonians, The</i> , from <i>The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul</i> , by Kirsopp C. Lake	234
<i>Beginning of Christianity, The: The Conversion of Paul</i> , by Clarence T. Craig	133
<i>Beginnings of the Christian Church, The: [Who Was This Paul?]</i> , by Hans Lietzmann	99
<i>Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul, The</i> , from <i>The Ethics of Paul</i> , by Morton S. Enslin	302
<i>Chapters in a Life of Paul: [The Pauline Chronology]</i> , by John Knox	161
<i>Character of Judaism, The</i> , from <i>Judaism</i> , by George F. Moore	56
<i>Charismatic Type, The</i> , from <i>The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man</i> , by Rudolf Otto	128
<i>Christian Beginnings: [An Ethical Anarchist]</i> , by Francis C. Burkitt	309
<i>Christianity According to St. Paul: The Death of Christ as a Sacrifice</i> , by G. A. A. Scott	326
<i>Concurrent Phases of Paul's Religion</i> , from <i>Studies in Early Christianity</i> , by Henry J. Cadbury	255
<i>Conversion of Paul, The</i> , from <i>The Beginning of Christianity</i> , by Clarence T. Craig	133
<i>[Critical Problems Related to Galatians]</i> , from <i>The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians</i> , by George S. Duncan	219
<i>Death of Christ as a Sacrifice, The</i> , from <i>Christianity According to St. Paul</i> , by G. A. A. Scott	326
<i>Did Paul See Jesus? from The Teachings of Paul in Terms of the Present Day</i> , by William M. Ramsay	122
<i>[Difficulties in Paul's Religion]</i> , from <i>Varieties of New Testament Religion</i> , by Ernest F. Scott	355
<i>Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, The: The Authenticity of 2 Thessalonians</i> , by Kirsopp C. Lake	234
<i>Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, The: [Critical Problems Related to Galatians]</i> , by George S. Duncan	219
<i>Epistle to the Ephesians, The</i> , from <i>The New Testament: Its Making and Meaning</i> , by Albert E. Barnett	215
<i>Epistle to the Romans, The: Jesus</i> , by Karl Barth	270
<i>Epistle to the Romans, The: Paul—His Religious Experience</i> , by Edward I. Bosworth	141
<i>[Ethical Anarchist, An]</i> , from <i>Christian Beginnings</i> , by Francis C. Burkitt	309
<i>Ethics of Paul, The: The Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul</i> , by Morton S. Enslin	302
<i>First Collection of Paul's Letters, The</i> , from <i>Introduction to the New Testament</i> , by Edgar J. Goodspeed	201
<i>Formative Influences</i> , from <i>The Story of St. Paul</i> , by Benjamin W. Bacon	106

<i>Fresh Approach to New Testament and Early Christian Literature, A:</i>	
Paul as a Letter Writer, by Martin Dibelius	177
<i>From Jesus to Paul: What Is Paul for the Jews?</i> by Joseph Klausner	368
Gentile World, The, from <i>The Life of St. Paul</i> , by F. J. Foakes-Jackson	17
<i>History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge: [Mystery Religions and Christianity]</i> , by Edwyn R. Bevan	42
<i>History of Primitive Christianity: The Theological Thinker</i> , by Johannes Weiss	398
How Paul Thought of Christ, from <i>According to Paul</i> , by Harris F. Rall	280
<i>Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament: Pauline Chronology</i> , by James Moffatt	157
<i>Introduction to the New Testament: The First Collection of Paul's Letters</i> , by Edgar J. Goodspeed	201
Jesus, from <i>The Epistle to the Romans</i> , by Karl Barth	270
[Jesus' Attitude Toward the Torah], from <i>Jesus and the Law of Moses</i> , by B. Harvie Branscomb	75
<i>Jesus and the Law of Moses: [Jesus' Attitude Toward the Torah]</i> , by B. Harvie Branscomb	75
<i>Jesus and His Sacrifice: The Sayings in the Pauline Narrative of the Last Supper</i> , by Vincent Taylor	318
<i>Jew and Greek: Tutors Unto Christ: The Preparation in Philosophy</i> , by G. H. C. Macgregor and Alexander C. Purdy	24
<i>Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, The: The Law, The Scribes, The Synagogue</i> , by Charles Guignebert	64
<i>Judaism: Character of Judaism</i> , by George F. Moore	56
<i>Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, The: The Charismatic Type</i> , by Rudolf Otto	128
Law, The, The Scribes, The Synagogue, from <i>The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus</i> , by Charles Guignebert	64
<i>Life of Jesus: The Pauline Evidence</i> , by Maurice Goguel	207
<i>Life of St. Paul, The: The Gentile World</i> , by F. J. Foakes-Jackson	17
<i>Light from the Ancient Past: The Martyrdom of Paul and Peter</i> , by Jack Finegan	170
Man Made Whole, The, from <i>The Mind of St. Paul</i> , by Arthur Holmes	147
Martyrdom of Paul and Peter, from <i>Light from the Ancient Past</i> , by Jack Finegan	170
<i>Meaning of Paul for Today: The Ancient Wrong</i> , by C. H. Dodd	263
<i>Mind of St. Paul, The: The Man Made Whole</i> , by Arthur Holmes	147
[Modernizing of Paul's Message, The], by Amos N. Wilder	409
<i>Munera Studiosa: The Sources of Pauline Mysticism</i> , by Chester C. McCown (eds. M. H. Shepherd and Sherman E. Johnson)	114
Mystery Initiation, from <i>Pagan Regeneration</i> , by Harold R. Willoughby	34
[Mystery Religions and Christianity], from <i>The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge</i> , by Edwyn R. Bevan	42
<i>Mysticism of St. Paul, The: The Pauline Epistles</i> , by Albert Schweitzer	239
<i>New Testament: Its Making and Meaning, The: The Epistle to the Ephesians</i> , by Albert E. Barnett	215
<i>Old Testament in the New Testament, The: [Paul's Use of the Old Testament]</i> , by R. V. G. Tasker	187
<i>Origin of Paul's Religion, The: Paul and Jesus</i> , by J. Gresham Machen	374
<i>Pagan Regeneration: Mystery Initiation</i> , by Harold R. Willoughby	34
<i>Paul: Paul's Importance in the History of the World</i> , by William Wrede	390

Paul and the Doctrine of Recompense, from <i>St. Paul's Conception of Recompense</i> , by Floyd V. Filson	293
Paul and Jesus, from <i>The Origin of Paul's Religion</i> , by J. Gresham Machen	374
Paul and Jesus, from <i>The Religion and Theology of Paul</i> , by William Morgan	381
Paul and the Old Testament, from <i>The Theology of St. Paul</i> , by Fernand Prat	197
Paul as a Letter Writer, from <i>A Fresh Approach to New Testament and Early Christian Literature</i> , by Martin Dibelius	177
Paul—His Religious Experience, from <i>The Epistle to the Romans</i> , by Edward I. Bosworth	141
<i>Paul: Man of Conflict: Survivals</i> , by Donald W. Riddle	393
<i>Paul of Tarsus: Tarsus</i> , by T. R. Glover	82
Paul, Philo, and the Intellectuals, by Mary E. Andrews	400
[Paul—Stranger and Saint], from <i>St. Paul</i> , by Heinrich Weinel	362
[Pauline Chronology, The], from <i>Chapters in a Life of Paul</i> , by John Knox	161
Pauline Chronology, from <i>Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament</i> by James Moffatt	157
[Pauline Corpus, The], from <i>The Primitive Church</i> , by Burnett H. Streeter	226
Pauline Epistles, The, from <i>The Mysticism of St. Paul</i> , by Albert Schweitzer	239
Pauline Evidence, The, from <i>The Life of Jesus</i> , by Maurice Goguel	207
Pauline Idea of Faith, The, from <i>The Pauline Idea of Faith in Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion</i> , by W. H. P. Hatch	342
<i>Pauline Idea of Faith in Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion, The: The Pauline Idea of Faith</i> , by W. H. P. Hatch	342
Paul's Importance in the History of the World, from <i>Paul</i> , by William Wrede	390
[Paul's Use of the Old Testament], from <i>The Old Testament in the New Testament</i> , by R. V. G. Tasker	187
The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Thought of Paul, by Frank C. Porter	283
Preparation in Philosophy, The, from <i>Jew and Greek: Tutors Unto Christ</i> , by G. H. C. Macgregor and Alexander C. Purdy	24
<i>Primitive, Church, The: [The Pauline Corpus]</i> , by Burnett H. Streeter	226
Relation of Paul to the Mystery-Religions, from <i>St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions</i> , by H. A. A. Kennedy	49
<i>Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, The: [Where Paul's Theology Begins]</i> , by Adolf Deissman	249
<i>Religion and Theology of Paul, The: Paul and Jesus</i> , by William Morgan	381
<i>St. Paul: [Paul—Stranger and Saint]</i> , by Heinrich Weinel	362
<i>St. Paul: The Style and Thought of Paul</i> , by Arthur D. Nock	182
<i>St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles: And the Rock Was Christ</i> , by Wilfred L. Knox	90
<i>St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions: Relation of Paul to the Mystery-Religions</i> , by H. A. A. Kennedy	49
<i>St. Paul's Conception of Recompense: Paul and the Doctrine of Recompense</i> , by Floyd V. Filson	293
Sayings in the Pauline Narrative of the Last Supper, The, from <i>Jesus and His Sacrifice</i> , by Vincent Taylor	318
Sources of Pauline Mysticism, The, from <i>Munera Studiosa</i> , by Chester C. McCown (eds. M. H. Shepherd and Sherman E. Johnson)	114
<i>Story of St. Paul, The: Formative Influences</i> , by Benjamin W. Bacon	106
<i>Studies in Early Christianity: Concurrent Phases of Paul's Religion</i> , by Henry J. Cadbury	255
Style and Thought of Paul, The, from <i>St. Paul</i> , by Arthur D. Nock	182
Survivals, from <i>Paul: Man of Conflict</i> , by Donald W. Riddle	393

Tarsus, from <i>Paul of Tarsus</i> , by T. R. Glover	82
<i>Teachings of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, The: Did Paul See Jesus?</i> by William M. Ramsay	122
Theological Thinker, <i>The</i> , from <i>History of Primitive Christianity</i> , by Johannes Weiss	398
<i>Theology of St. Paul, The: Paul and the Old Testament</i> , by Fernand Prat	197
<i>Varieties of New Testament Religion: [Difficulties in Paul's Religion]</i> , by Ernest F. Scott	355
What Is Paul for the Jews, from <i>From Jesus to Paul</i> , by Joseph Klausner	368
[Where Paul's Theology Begins], from <i>The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul</i> , by Adolf Deissmann	249
[Who Was This Paul?], from <i>The Beginnings of the Christian Church</i> , by Hans Lietzmann	99

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



139 909

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

